ARIS & PHILLIPS CLASSICAL TEXTS

EURIPIDES

The Children of Heracles

EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION & COMMENTARY BY

William Allan

EURIPIDES

The Children of Heracles
ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΑΙ

for Dorothea

ARIS & PHILLIPS CLASSICAL TEXTS

EURIPIDES

The Children of Heracles

Edited with an introduction, translation and commentary by

William Allan

Aris & Phillips is an imprint of Oxbow Books

First published in the United Kingdom in 2001. Reprinted 2015 by
OXBOW BOOKS
10 Hythe Bridge Street, Oxford OX1 2EW

and in the United States by
OXBOW BOOKS
908 Darby Road, Havertown, PA 19083

© The author William Allan

Paperback Edition: ISBN 978-0-85668-741-9

Greek Text © Oxford University Press 1984. Reprinted from Euripides: Fabulae: Volume I edited by James Diggle (Oxford Classical Texts, 1984) by permission of Oxford University Press.

A CIP record for this book is available from the British Library

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from the publisher in writing.

For a complete list of Aris & Phillips titles, please contact:

UNITED KINGDOM
Oxbow Books
Telephone (01865) 241249
Fax (01865) 794449
Email: oxbow@oxbowbooks.com
www.oxbowbooks.com

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Oxbow Books
Telephone (800) 791-9354
Fax (610) 853-9146
Email: queries@casemateacademic.com
www.casemateacademic.com/oxbow

Oxbow Books is part of the Casemate Group

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Marston Book Services Ltd, Oxfordshire

Contents

Preface viii
General Editor's Foreword ix
Abbreviations and Bibliography for The Children of Herakles x
General Bibliography for Euripides xiii

INTRODUCTION 21
1. Myth 22
2. Integrity and Structure of the Play 35
3. Suppliant Tragedy 39
4. Tragedy and History 43
5. Setting and Staging 46
6. The Heraclidae in Art 52
7. The Date of the Play 54
8. The Transmission of the Text 56

TEXT AND TRANSLATION 59

COMMENTARY 131

Preface

The Children of Heracles, though often overlooked as a mechanical and dull panegyric of Athens, is in fact a dynamic and effective tragedy. This book aims to understand the play as far as possible within its historical context. In so doing it seeks to illustrate how the work was able to address the interests and dilemmas of its original fifth-century Athenian audience, challenging them to reflect on substantial problems of morality, politics, and law within their own society: the proper treatment of refugees and prisoners of war, for example, or the struggle between ethical conduct and the untrammelled exercise of power. Such issues, no less relevant or pressing in our own time, may still be illuminated by a reading of Euripides' play.

My work on this project was made possible by a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellowship. I am immensely grateful to the British Academy for its generous support and particularly to Dr Ken Emond for his kind assistance. My thanks go also to St Anne's College, Oxford, my host institution for the Fellowship, where I enjoyed ideal conditions for teaching and research, and where Matthew Leigh and Roger Crisp offered much stimulation and encouragement. Particular thanks are due to Jasper Griffin, Edith Hall, Gordon Howie, Gregory Hutchinson, Brad Levett, Nino Luraghi, Pantelis Michelakis, Robert Parker, Richard Rutherford, Charles Segal, and Oliver Taplin for many valuable suggestions. Finally, Christopher Collard has been a brilliant general editor and I owe him a special debt for his careful and perceptive comments on the whole work.

July 2001 W. R. A.

GENERAL EDITOR'S FOREWORD

Euripides' remarkable variety of subject, ideas and methods challenges each generation of readers – and audiences – to fresh appraisal and closer definition. This Series of his plays is in the general style of Aris and Phillips' Classical Texts: it offers university students and, we hope, sixth-formers, as well as teachers of Classics and Classical Civilisation at all levels, new editions which will emphasise analytical and literary appreciation. In each volume there is an editor's Introduction which sets the play in its original context, discusses its dramatic and poetic resources, and assesses its meaning. The Greek text is faced on the opposite page by a new English prose translation which attempts to be both accurate and idiomatic. The Commentary, keyed wherever possible to the translation rather than the Greek, pursues the aims of the Introduction in analysing structure and development, annotating and appreciating poetic style, and explaining the ideas; since the translation itself reveals the editor's detailed understanding of the Greek, philological comment is confined to special phenomena or problems which affect interpretation. These are the guidelines within which individual contributors to the Series have been asked to work, but they are free to handle or emphasise whatever they judge important in their particular play, and to choose their own manner of doing so. It is natural that commentaries and commentators on Euripides should reflect his variety as a poet.

Nineteen volumes have now been published in the Series, including two of Selected Fragmentary Plays. The last will be Iphigenia in Aulis (Christopher Collard with James Morwood). It is still hoped to publish the almost certainly spurious Rhesus, but outside the Euripidean series.

Christopher Collard, Oxford
March 2015

Abbreviations and Bibliography

Ancient authors and works are generally referred to in accordance with *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Third Edition, Edited by S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (Oxford, 1996), xxix-liv. Journal titles are abbreviated as in *L'Année Philologique*. Forms such as n. 72 refer to the relevant footnote in the Introduction, while 72n. refers to the relevant line of the Commentary. Frequently cited books and articles are listed in the bibliography below: these appear in the text in abbreviated form, e.g. Zuntz (1947). Details of other works are given at their first occurrence in the text and cross-referenced thereafter. For the General Bibliography to the series, see pp. 229–34.

Abbreviated Works of Reference:

CAH IV J. Boardman et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History: Volume IV* (Second edition, Cambridge, 1988).

CAH V D. M. Lewis et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History: Volume V* (Second edition, Cambridge, 1992).

Dale, *MATC* See General Bibliography XI.

FGrH F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Leiden, 1923-58).

GP J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Second edition, Oxford, 1954).

IG *Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin, 1873-).

K-G R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* (Hannover, 1898-1904).

LIMC H. Ackermann and J.-R. Gisler (eds.), *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (Zurich, 1981-97).

LSJ H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*[9] (Oxford, 1925-40).

RE G. Wissowa et al. (eds.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1893-1980).

Select bibliography:

Albini, U. (1993), 'La falsa convenzionalità degli Eraclidi', *SIFC* 11: 106-11.

Avery, H. C. (1971), 'Euripides' *Heraclidae*', *AJP* 92: 539-65.

Burian, P. (1977), 'Euripides' *Heraclidae*: An Interpretation', *CP* 72: 1-21.

Burkert, W. (1985), *Greek Religion* (trans. J. Raffan, Cambridge, MA).

Burnett, A. P. (1976), 'Tribe and City, Custom and Decree in *Children of Heracles*', *CP* 71: 4-26.

——— (1998), *Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy* (Berkeley).

Cairns, D. (1993), *Aidôs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature* (Oxford).

Conacher, D. J. (1967), see General Bibliography VI.

Csapo, E. and Slater, W. J. (1995), see General Bibliography VI.

Dale, A. M. (1968), see General Bibliography XI.

Davidson, J. (1996), 'Two Notes on Euripides' *Heraclidae*', *Athenaeum* 84: 243-7.

Dover, K. J. (1974), *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford).

Falkner, T. M. (1989), 'The Wrath of Alcmene: Gender, Authority and Old Age in Euripides' *Children of Heracles*', in T. M. Falkner and J. de Luce (eds.), *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature* (Albany, NY), 114-31.

Fitton, J. W. (1961), 'The Suppliant Women and the Heraclidae of Euripides', *Hermes* 89: 430-61.

Gladstone, R. (1959), 'Introduction to the *Heracleidae*', in D. Greene and R. Lattimore (eds.), *The Complete Greek Tragedies. Volume III: Euripides* (Chicago), 110-14.

Gould, J. (1973), '*Hiketeia*', *JHS* 93: 74-103.

Grube, G. M. A. (1961), see General Bibliography VI.

Harder, A. (ed.) (1985), *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos* (Leiden).

Kearns, E. (1989), *The Heroes of Attica* (*BICS* Suppl. 57, London).

Kovacs, D. (1996), see General Bibliography I.

Krummen, E. (1993), 'Athens and Attica: *Polis* and Countryside in Tragedy', in A. H. Sommerstein et al. (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the the Polis* (Bari), 191-217.

Lesky, A. (1977), 'On the *Heraclidae* of Euripides', *YCS* 25: 227-38.

Lloyd, M. (1992), see General Bibliography IX.

Malkin, I. (1994), *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (Cambridge).

Mastronarde, D. J. (1979), see General Bibliography IX.

McLean, J. (1934), 'The *Heraclidae* of Euripides', *AJP* 55: 197-224.

O'Connor-Visser, E. A. M. E. (1987), *Aspects of Human Sacrifice in the Tragedies of Euripides* (Amsterdam).

Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. (1968), see General Bibliography VIII.

Parker, R. (1983), *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford).

——— (1996), *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford).

Rehm, R. (1988), 'The Staging of Suppliant Plays', *GRBS* 29: 263-307.

Schmitt, J. (1921), *Freiwilliger Opfertod bei Euripides* (Giessen).

Seaford, R. (1994), see General Bibliography VI.

Spranger, J. A. (1925), 'The Political Element in the *Heraclidae* of Euripides', *CQ* 19: 117-29.

Stevens, P. T. (1976), see General Bibliography X.

Stoessl, F. (1956), 'Die Herakliden des Euripides', *Philologus* 100: 207-34.

Strohm, H. (1957), see General Bibliography IX.
Taplin, O. (1977), see General Bibliography VI.
Visser, M. (1982), 'Worship your Enemy: Aspects of the Cult of Heroes in Ancient Greece', *HTR* 75: 403-28.
Wiles, D. (1997), see General Bibliography VIII.
Wilkins (1990a) 'The Young of Athens: Religion and Society in the *Herakleidai* of Euripides', *CQ* 40: 329-39.
——— (1990b), 'The State and the Individual: Euripides' Plays of Voluntary Self-Sacrifice', in A. Powell (ed.), *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality* (London), 177-94.
Webster, T. B. L. (1967), see General Bibliography VI.
Whitehead, D. (1986), *The Demes of Attica 508/7- ca. 250 B.C.* (Princeton).
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1882a), 'De Euripidis Heraclidis Commentatiuncula', Index Schol. in Univ. Gryphiswaldensi, iii-xvi [= *Kleine Schriften I* (Berlin, 1971) 62-81].
——— (1882b), 'Exkurse zu Euripides Herakliden', *Hermes* 17: 337-64 [= *Kleine Schriften I* 82-109].
Zuntz, G. (1947), 'Is the *Heraclidae* Mutilated?', *CQ* 41: 46-52.

The following works are referred to by surname only:

Diggle J. Diggle, *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994).
Garzya A. Garzya (ed.), *Euripides: Heraclidae* (Leipzig, 1972).
Goodwin W. W Goodwin, *Syntax of Greek Moods and Tenses* (London, 1889).
Paley F. A. Paley (ed.), *Euripides, Vol. I* (London, 1872).
Pearson A. C. Pearson (ed.), *Euripides: The Heraclidae* (Cambridge, 1907).
Smyth H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. G. M. Messing, Cambridge, MA, 1956).
Wilkins J. Wilkins (ed.), *Euripides: Heraclidae* (Oxford, 1993).
Zuntz G. Zuntz, *The Political Plays of Euripides* (Manchester, 1955).

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR EURIPIDES

This Bibliography is compiled and updated by the General Editor, most recently in May 2012. It concentrates on works in English.

I. *Complete critical editions*

The standard edition is by J. Diggle in the Oxford Classical Texts (3 volumes, 1981–94). To accompany his edition Diggle published many papers on the manuscripts and on individual plays, collected in his *Studies on the Texts of Euripides* (Oxford, 1981) and *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994).

The edition of R. Prinz and N. Wecklein (Leipzig, 1878–1902) is still useful for its *apparatus* and *appendices*. The Collection Budé edition by L. Méridier and others was completed in 2003 (8 volumes, Paris, 1923–2003); it has a French translation, introductory essays and in the very latest volumes, many notes (see also under Fragments below). The Bibliotheca Teubneriana issued all of plays singly, each with bibliography and some with brief critical notes, by different editors (Leipzig, 1964–95); some have been revised, some discontinued.

D. Kovacs has published text-critical notes, in association with his Loeb edition and translation (Section III below), in *Euripidea* (Leiden and New York, 1994), *Euripidea Altera* (1996) and *Euripidea Tertia* (2003). See also under 'Fragments' below.

History of the text: W. S. Barrett, *Euripides. Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964), 45–90; G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965), esp. 249–88; K. Matthiessen, *Studien zur Textüberlieferung der* Hekabe *des Euripides* (Heidelberg, 1974); D. Mastronarde and J. M. Bremer, *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Phoinissai* (Berkeley, 1982); J. Diggle, *Praefatio* to his Oxford Classical Text, Vol. 1, v–xiv, and *The Textual Tradition of Euripides' Orestes* (Oxford, 1991); Garland (Section XII below), 39–145 (with comprehensive bibliography); P. Carrara, *Il Testo di Euripide nell' antichità* (Florence, 2009: exhaustive study of the papyri of both extant and fragmentary plays).

Ancient evidence about Euripides' life and work is gathered by R. Kannicht in *TrGF* 5.1.39–150 and (with translation) by D. Kovacs in *Euripidea* (1994), 1–141.

Fragments

Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, Volumes 5.1 and 5.2 ed. R. Kannicht (Göttingen, 2004), is the standard critical edition; it contains many interpretative notes on the text. The Collection Budé *Euripide*, VIII. 1–4 ed. F. Jouan and H. van Looy (Paris, 1998–2003) is a complete edition with extremely full general introduction, lengthy essays on individual fragmentary plays, French translation and some notes. There is now a Loeb Classical Library edition of the Fragments, ed. C. Collard and M. J. Cropp, 2 Volumes (2008), with general introductory matter, texts, translations and some notes, together with introductory essays to individual plays. All these editions all contain generous bibliographies.

Partial editions: C. Austin, *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris Reperta* (Berlin, 1968) and J. Diggle, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta* (Oxford, 1998), 79–169, both with Latin apparatus only; in this Series, C. Collard, M. J. Cropp, K. H. Lee, J. Gibert, *Selected Fragmentary Plays* (Vol. 1, Warminster, 1995, rev. Oxford, 2009; Vol. 2, Oxford, 2004): vol. 1 has *Bellerophon*, *Cresphontes*, *Cretans*, *Erectheus*, *Melanippe Desmotis*, *Melanippe Sophe*, *Phaethon*, *Stheneboea*, *Telephus*; vol. 2 has *Alexandros* (together with *Palamedes* and *Sisyphus*), *Andromeda*, *Antiope*, *Archelaus*, *Hypsipyle*, *Oedipus*, *Philoctetes*; there are introductory essays to individual plays, translation and notes. Many individual plays have received annotated editions in English and particularly in other languages: for these, and for specialist works on fragments, see the various bibliographies mentioned above. For the papyri note Carrara above.

II. *Commentaries*

E. Schwartz, *Scholia in Euripidem* (Berlin, 1887–91): nine plays only. A more widely based edition of the ancient and medieval scholia is needed. A comprehensive online edition is being prepared by D. Mastronarde: see http://euripidesscholia.org/.

Complete commentary: F. A. Paley (London, 1857^1–1880^3): commonsensical and still useful.

Major or 'reference' commentaries on single plays: *Bacchae*, ed. E. R. Dodds (Oxford, 1960^2); *Cyclops*, ed. R. Seaford (Oxford, 1984); *Helena*, ed. R. Kannicht (2 volumes, Heidelberg, 1969); *Heraclidae*, ed. J. Wilkins (Oxford, 1993); *Herakles*, ed. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (3 volumes, Berlin, 1895^2; reprinted Bad Homburg, 1959); *Heracles*, ed. G. W. Bond (Oxford, 1981); *Hippolytos*, ed. W. S. Barrett (Oxford 1964); *Iphigenie in Aulis*, ed. W. Stockert (2 volumes, Vienna, 1992); *Iphigenia in Tauris*, ed. P. Kyriakou (Berlin, 2006); *Orestes*, ed. C. W. Willink (Oxford, 1986); *Phoenissae*, ed. D. J. Mastronarde (Cambridge, 1994); *Supplices*, ed. C. Collard (2 volumes, Groningen, 1975).

Major commentaries on the other tragedians important for reference are *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*, ed. E. Fraenkel (3 volumes, Oxford, 1950); *Choephori*, ed. A. F. Garvie (Oxford, 1986); *Persae*, A. F. Garvie (Oxford, 2009); *Supplices*, ed. H. Friis Johansen and E.W. Whittle (3 volumes, Copenhagen, 1980); *Sophocles. The Plays*, ed. R. C. Jebb (7 volumes, Cambridge, 1883^1–1903^3; reprinted with new introductions under the editorship of P. E. Easterling, Bristol, 2004); P. J. Finglass, *Electra* (Cambridge, 2007), *Ajax* (Cambridge, 2011); M. Davies, *Trachiniae* (Oxford, 1991); *The Fragments*, ed. A. C. Pearson (3 volumes, Cambridge, 1917).

For important 'monograph' commentaries on individual plays of Euripides see also the end of Section VI.2 below.

Each volume of this Series lists earlier commentaries on its title-play.

III. *Complete English Translations*

Grene, D. and R. Lattimore, R. 1958–9. *The Complete Greek Tragedies: Euripides* (2 volumes). Chicago.

Kovacs, D. 1995–2002. *Euripides*. Cambridge MA and London. 6 volumes, Loeb Classical Library.

Morwood, J., Waterfield, R. and Hall, E. 1997–2003. Oxford. 5 volumes, Oxford World's Classics. New translations with lengthy introductions, bibliographies and notes.

Davie, J. and Rutherford, R. 1997–2005. Harmondsworth. 4 volumes. Penguin Classics. New translations with introductions, bibliographies and notes.
For the fragmentary plays see under *Fragments* above.

IV. *Lexicography*

Allen, J. T. and Italie, G. 1953–4, reprinted Groningen, 1970. *A Concordance to Euripides*. Berkeley and London. *Supplement* by C. Collard, 1971, Groningen. Further *Supplementum* by R. Kannicht, *TrGF* 5.2 (Section I above), 1036–43.
Rigo, G. 2005. *Euripide . . . Index verborum. Listes de fréquence*. Liège.

V. *Bibliography*

L'Année Philologique has recorded publications since 1924.
Jakob, D. and Said, S. 1988. *Métis* 3, 364–512. Greek Tragedy, 1500–1988.
Hose, M. and others. 2005. *Lustrum* 47: *Euripides* I. Separate bibliographies for the complete plays, 1970–2000.

VI. *General studies and handbooks (Greek tragedy; Euripides)*

VI.1. *Works on Greek tragedy in general including Euripides*
Belfiore, E. S. 2000. *Murder among Friends. Violation of* Philia *in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
Burnett, A. P. 1998. *Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy*. Berkeley and London.
Bushnell, R. ed. 2005. *A Companion to Tragedy*. Oxford. Essays on the genre from antiquity to the present.
The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy, ed. P. E. Easterling, 1977. Cambridge.
The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, Volume I: Greek Literature, ed. P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox, 1985. Cambridge. Pp. 258–345 'Greek Tragedy' with bibliography, pp. 758–73.
Collard, C. 2007. *Tragedy, Euripides and Euripideans*. Exeter. Collected papers.
Cousland, J. R. C. and Hume, J. R., eds. 2009. *The Play of Texts and Fragments. Essays in honour of Martin Cropp*. Leiden.
Cropp, M. J., Fantham, E. and Scully, S. E. eds. 1986. *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy. Essays presented to D. J. Conacher*. Calgary.
Foley, H. P. 2001. *Female Acts in Greek Tragedy*. Princeton.
Goldhill, S. 1986. *Reading Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge. 'An advanced critical introduction'.
Gregory, J., ed. 2005. *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Oxford.
Hall, E. 2010. *Greek Tragedy. Suffering under the Sun*, Oxford.
Halliwell, S. 1987. *The* Poetics *of Aristotle*. London. Translation and commentary.
Heath, M. 1987. *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*. London.
Kitto, H. D. F. 1961. *Greek Tragedy. A literary study*. Third edition. London.
Kranz, W. 1933. *Stasimon*. Berlin. Fundamental work on the Chorus.
Kraus, C. and others, eds. 2007. *Visualizing the Tragic. Drama, myth and ritual in Greek art and literature. Essays in honour of Froma Zeitlin*. Oxford.
Lesky, A. 1983. *Greek Tragic Poetry*. London. Transl. M. Dillon from the third German edition, Göttingen, 1972.
Loraux, N. 2002. *The Mourning Voice in Greek Tragedy*. Ithaca.

McClure, L. 1999. *Spoken like a Woman. Speech and gender in Athenian drama*. Princeton.
Padel, R. 1995. *Whom Gods Destroy. Elements of Greek and tragic madness*. Princeton.
Padel, R. 2002. *In and Out of the Mind. Greek images of the tragic self*. Princeton.
Rabinowitz, N. S. 2008. *Greek Tragedy*. Malden MA and Oxford. An uncomplicated introductory guide.
Rehm, R. 1992. *Greek Tragic Theatre*. London.
Rehm, R. 1994. *Marriage to Death. The conflation of wedding and funeral in Greek tragedy*. Princeton.
Roisman. H. ed. forthcoming. *Encyclopedia of Greek Tragedy*. 2 volumes. Malden MA and Oxford.
Rutherford R. 2012. *Greek Tragic Style. Form, language and interpretation*. Cambridge.
Scodel, R. 1999. *Credible Impossibilities. Conventions and strategies of verisimilitude in Homer and Greek tragedy*. Stuttgart.
Scodel, R. 2010. *An Introduction to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge.
Segal E. 1984. (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford: important essays by leading scholars reprinted.
Sewell-Rutter, N. J. 2007. *Guilt by Descent. Moral inheritance and decision-making in Greek tragedy*. Oxford.
Silk, M. A., ed., 1977. *Tragedy and the Tragic*. Oxford. Important and wide-ranging collection of papers.
Sommerstein, A. H. 2002. *Greek Drama and Dramatists*. London. Excellent basic introduction.
Storey, I. C. and Allan, A. 2005. *A Guide to Ancient Greek Drama*. Oxford. Introduction to the phenomena, and to appreciation.
Stanford, W. B. 1983. *Greek Tragedy and the Emotions*. London.
Taplin, O. P. 1977. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus*. Oxford. Important for all Greek tragedy.
Taplin, O. P. 1978. *Greek Tragedy in Action*. London. Vigorous introduction.
Vernant, J.-P. and Vidal-Naquet, P. 1988. *Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece*. Second edition. New York (orig. French, Paris, 1972 and 1986).
Wilson, P. 2000. 'Powers of horror and laughter: the great age of drama', in O. P. Taplin ed., *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, Oxford, 88–132 = *Literature in the Greek World* (Oxford, 2001), 70–114.
Yale Classical Studies 25, 1977: *Greek Tragedy*. Papers by prominent scholars.
Zimmerman, B. 1991. *Greek Tragedy*. Baltimore and London. A very good general introductory book.

VI.2. *Works primarily on Euripides*

Aélion, R. 1983. *Euripide. Héritier d'Eschyle*. 2 volumes. Paris.
Aélion, R. 1986. *Quelques grands mythes dans l'oeuvre d'Euripide*. Paris. Deals extensively also with the fragmentary plays.
Burian, P., ed.1985. *New Directions in Euripidean Criticism*. Durham NC.
Burnett, A. P. 1971. *Catastrophe Survived. Euripides' plays of mixed reversal*. Oxford.
Chong-Gossard, J. H. Kim On. 2008. *Gender and Communication in Euripides' Plays*. Leiden.
Conacher, D. J. 1967. *Euripidean Drama. Myth, theme and structure*. Toronto.
Erbse, H. 1984. *Studien zum Prolog der euripideischen Tragödie*. Berlin. Analyses complete plays.
Foley, H. P. 1985. *Ritual Irony. Poetry and sacrifice in Euripides*. Ithaca.
Hose, M. 1990–1. *Studien zum Chor bei Euripides*. 2 volumes, Stuttgart.
Mastronarde, D. J. 2010. *The Art of Euripides*. Cambridge.

Matthiessen, K. 2002 and 2004. *Die Tragödien des Euripides* and *Euripides und sein Jahrhundert*. Munich. As yet the only comprehensive monograph on Euripides.
Michelini, A. N. 1987. *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition*. Madison. Wide-ranging; contains a historical survey of Euripidean criticism.
Mitchell-Boyask, R., ed. forthcoming. *A Companion to Euripides*. Malden MA and Oxford.
Morwood, J. 2002. *The Plays of Euripides*. Bristol. Stimulating brief personal assessment.
Mossman, J. 2003. ed. *Oxford Readings in Euripides*. Oxford. Seventeen essays by leading scholars reprinted from the years 1960 to 1993, with concise editor's introduction.
Webster, T. B. L. 1967. *The Tragedies of Euripides*. London. A profile of Euripides' dramatic and poetic career as it developed.

The following 'monograph' commentaries on individual plays of Euripides contain much of wider interest and importance:

Allan, W. 2000. *The* Andromache *and Euripidean Tragedy*. Oxford.
Boas, E. H. van Emde. forthcoming. *Linguistic Studies in Euripides'* Electra. Oxford.
Croally, N. T. 1994. *Euripidean Polemic: the* Trojan Women *and the function of tragedy*. Cambridge.
Mendelsohn, D. 2002. *Gender and the City in Euripides' Political Plays*. Oxford.
Mossman, J. 1995. *Wild Justice. A study of Euripides'* Hecuba. Oxford.
Porter, J. R. 1994. *Studies in Euripides'* Orestes. Leiden.
Segal, C. 1993. *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow. Art, gender and commemoration in* Alcestis, Hippolytus *and* Hecuba. Durham NC and London.
Thumiger, C. 2007. *Hidden Paths. Self and Characterization in Greek Tragedy. Euripides'* Bacchae. London.
Winnington-Ingram, R. P. 1948. *Euripides and Dionysus*. Cambridge. Second edition with new Foreword by P. E. Easterling, Bristol, 1997. On *Bacchae*.
Wright, M. 2005. *Euripides' Escape Tragedies. A study of* Helen, Andromeda *and* Iphigenia among the Taurians. Oxford.
Zacharia, K. 2003. *Converging Truths. Euripides'* Ion *and the Athenian quest for self-definition*. Leiden and Boston.

Note also the expanding series of Duckworth Companions to Greek Tragedy, which offers appreciations of individual plays.

VII. *Tragedy, particularly Euripides, and contemporary events, culture and ideas*

Barker, E. 2009. *Entering the Agon. Dissent and authority in Homer, historiography and tragedy*. Oxford.
Buxton, R. G. A. 1982. *Persuasion in Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge.
Carter, D. , ed. 2011. *Why Athens? A reappraisal of tragic politics*. Oxford.
Conacher, D. J. 1998. *Euripides and the Sophists*. London.
Egli, F. 2003. *Euripides im Kontext zeitgenössischer intellektueller Strömungen*. Munich.
Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R., eds. 1999. *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge.
Gould, J. 2001. *Myth, Ritual Memory and Exchange. Essays in Greek literature and culture*. Oxford.

Gregory, J. 1991. *Euripides and the Instruction of the Athenians*. Ann Arbor.
Hall, E. 1991. *Inventing the Barbarian. Greek self-definition through tragedy*. Oxford.
Hall, E. 2006. *The Theatrical Cast of Athens. Interactions between ancient Greek drama and society*. Oxford.
Markantonatos, A. and Zimmermann, B. 2011. *Crisis on Stage. Tragedy and comedy in late fifth-century Athens*. Berlin.
Mikalson, J. A. 1991. *Honor Thy Gods. Popular religion in Greek tragedy*. Chapel Hill.
Mitchell-Boyask, R. 2007. *Plague and the Athenian Imagination. Drama, history and the cult of Asclepius*. Cambridge and New York.
Pelling, C. 1997. *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*. Oxford.
Powell, A. ed. 1990. *Euripides, Women and Sexuality*. London.
Rabinowitz, N. S. 1993. *Anxiety Veiled. Euripides and the traffic in women*. Ithaca and London.
Revermann, M. and Wilson, P., eds. 2008. *Performance, Iconography, Reception. Studies in honour of Oliver Taplin*. Oxford.
Seaford, R. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual. Homer and tragedy in the developing city-state*. Oxford.
Shapiro, H. A. 1994. *Myth and Art. Poet and painter in classical Greece*. London and New York.
Sommerstein, A. H. and others. 1993. *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis*. Bari.
Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 2003. *Tragedy and Athenian Religion*. Lanham.
Stevens, P. T. 1956. Euripides and the Athenians. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 76: 76–84. Contemporary reception.
Syropoulos, S. D. 2003. *Gender and the Social Function of Athenian Tragedy*. Oxford. BAR International Series, 1127.
Winkler, J. J. and Zeitlin, F. I., eds. 1990. *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian drama in its social context*. Princeton.
Winnington-Ingram, R. 1969. Euripides. *Poiêtês sophos*. *Arethusa* 2: 127–42. Need for balanced interpretation of Euripides' cleverness.
Yunis, H. 1996. *Taming Democracy. Models of political rhetoric in classical Athens*. Cornell.
Zuntz, G. 1963. *The Political Plays of Euripides*. Second edition. Manchester (orig. 1955).

VIII. *Theatre and production: tragedy and particularly Euripides*

Arnott, P. D. 1962. *Greek Scenic Conventions in the Fifth Century B.C*. Oxford.
Arnott, P. D. 1989. *Public and Performance in the Greek Theatre*. London and New York.
The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre, ed. M. McDonald and J. M. Walton, 2007. Cambridge.
Csapo, E. 2010. *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theater*. Malden MA and Oxford.
Csapo, E. and Miller, M. C., eds. 2007. *The Origins of Theater in Ancient Greece and Beyond. From ritual to drama*. Cambridge.
Csapo, E., and Slater, W. J. 1994. *The Context of Ancient Drama*. Ann Arbor. Comprehensive collection of ancient sources in translation.
Easterling, P. E. and Hall, E., eds. 2002. *Greek and Roman Actors: aspects of an ancient profession*. Cambridge.
Green, J. R. 1994. *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society*. London.
Ley, G. 1991. *Ancient Greek Theatre*. Chicago. Brief general introduction.
Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 1946. *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens*. Oxford.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 1962. *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* (2nd ed. by T. B. L. Webster). Oxford. Fundamental work on 'origins'.
Pickard-Cambridge, A. W. 1988. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. Oxford. Second edition revised by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis (1968), reissued with supplement and corrections.
Webster, T. B. L. 2000. *Greek Theatre Performance. An introduction*. Cambridge.
Wilson, P. 2000. *The Athenian Institution of the Khorêgia. The chorus, the city and the stage*. Cambridge.
Wilson, P., ed. 2007. *The Greek Theatre and Festivals. Documentary studies*. Oxford.

IX. *Dramatic form and theatrical technique: tragedy and particularly Euripides*

Bain, D. 1977. *Actors and Audience. A study of asides and related conventions in Greek tragedy*. Oxford.
Barrett, J. 2002. *Staged Narrative. Poetics and the messenger in Greek tragedy*. Berkeley.
De Jong, I. 1991. *Narrative in Drama. The art of the Euripidean messenger-speech*. Leiden.
Dubischar, M. 2001. *Die Agonszenen bei Euripides. Untersuchungen zu ausgewählten Dramen*. Stuttgart.
Dunn, F. M. 1996. *Tragedy's End. Closure and innovation in Euripidean drama*. New York.
Goward, B. 1999. *Telling Tragedy. Narrative technique in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides*. London.
Halleran, M. R. 1985. *Stagecraft in Euripides*. London.
Hourmouziades, N. C. 1965. *Production and Imagination in Euripides*. Athens.
Jens, W. ed. 1971. *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie*. Munich.
Ley, G. 2007. *The Theatricality of Greek Tragedy. Playing space and chorus*. Chicago and London.
Lloyd, M. 1992. *The* Agon *in Euripides*. Oxford.
Mastronarde, D. J. 1979. *Contact and Discontinuity. Some conventions of speech and action on the Greek tragic stage*. Berkeley.
Rehm, R. 2002. *The Play of Space. Spatial transformation in Greek tragedy*. Princeton.
Swift, L. *The Hidden Chorus. Echoes of genre in tragic lyric*. Oxford.
Wiles, D. 1997. *Tragedy in Athens. Performance space and theatrical meaning*. Cambridge.
Wiles, D. 2007. *Mask and Performance in Greek Tragedy. From ancient festival to modern experimentation*. Cambridge.
See also Barker in VII above.

X. *Euripides' language and style*

Barlow, S. A. 2008. *The Imagery of Euripides*. Third edition. London. Widest appreciative study.
Breitenbach, W. 1934. *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der euripideischen Lyrik*. Stuttgart. *Index Locorum* by K. H. Lee, 1979, Amsterdam.
Kurtz, E. 1985. *Die bildliche Ausdrucksweise in den Tragödien des Euripides*. Amsterdam.
Mastronarde, D. J. 2002. *Euripides. Medea*, Cambridge, pp. 81–96.
Stevens, P. T. 1976. *Colloquial Expressions in Euripides*. Wiesbaden. *Supplement* by C. Collard in *Classical Quarterly n.s.* 55 (2005), 350–86.
Stieber, M. C. 2009. *Euripides and the Language of Craft*. Leiden.
See also Rutherford in VI.1 above.

XI. *Verse and metre in tragedy*

Dale, A. M. 1968. *The Lyric Metres of Greek Drama*. Second edition. Cambridge.

Dale, A. M. 1971, 1981, 1983. *Metrical Analyses of Tragic Choruses. 1. Dactylo-Epitrite, 2. Aeolo-Choriambic, 3. Dochmiac etc.* London. Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Suppl. 21.1–3. Index of Choruses in 21.3.

Raven, D. S. 1962. *Greek Metre*. London. Analyses many complete odes.

West, M. L. 1987. *Introduction to Greek Metre*. Oxford. Abridged and slightly simplified version of West's *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982).

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1921. *Griechische Verskunst*. Berlin. Analyses and interprets many complete odes.

XII. *Survival and later performances and reception of Greek tragedy*

Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama. Ioannou Classics Centre, University of Oxford (www.apgrd.ox.ac.uk). Directed by E. Hall, O. P. Taplin and P. Brown. Printed, visual and aural documentation of performances since antiquity.

Dioniso. An Italian periodical, revived in 2002, with essays on all ancient drama, particularly ancient theatres and modern performance; splendidly illustrated.

Flashar, H. 1991. *Inszenierung der Antike. Das griechische Drama auf der Bühne der Neuzeit 1585–1988*. Munich.

Garland, R. 2004. *Surviving Greek Tragedy*. London. From antiquity to the present; comprehensive.

Gildenhard, I. and M. Revermann, eds. 2010. *Beyond the Fifth Century. Interactions with Greek tragedy from the fourth century BCE to the Middle Ages*. Berlin.

Goldhill, S. 2007. *How to Stage Greek Tragedy Today*. Chicago and London.

Green, J. R. and Handley, E. W. 1995. *Images of the Greek Theatre*. London and Austin.

Hall, E., Macintosh, F. and Taplin, O. P., eds. 2002. *Medea in Performance, 1500–2000*. Oxford.

Hall, E. Macintosh, F. and Wrigley, A., eds. 2004. *Dionysus since 1969. Greek tragedy at the dawn of the third Millennium*. Oxford.

Hall, E. and Macintosh, F. 2004. *Greek Tragedy in the British Theatre, 1660–1914*. Oxford.

Hall, E. and S. Harrop, eds. *Theorising Performance. Greek drama, cultural history and critical practice*. London.

Hardwick, L. and others, eds. 2000. *Selected Proceedings of the January Conference 1999: Theatre Ancient and Modern*. The Open University, Milton Keynes.

Hardwick, L. 2003. *Reception Studies*. Oxford. *Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics*, 33.

McDonald, M. 1992. *Ancient Sun, Modern Light. Greek drama on the modern stage*. New York.

McDonald, M. 2003. *The Living Art of Greek Tragedy*. Bloomington.

Mackinnon, K. 1986. *Greek Tragedy into Film*. London and Sydney.

Mitchell-Boyask, R. 2002. *Approaches to Teaching the Dramas of Euripides*. New York.

Philippo, S. 2003. *Silent Witness. Racine's non-verbal annotation of Euripides*. Oxford.

Rehm, R. 2003. *Radical Theatre. Greek tragedy and the modern world*. London.

Riley, K. 2008. *The Reception of Euripides' Herakles*. Oxford.

Taplin, O. P. 1993. *Comic Angels and Other Approaches to Greek Drama through Vase-Paintings*. Oxford.

Taplin, O. 2007. *Pots and Plays. Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase-Painting of the Fourth Century B.C.* Malibu.

Trendall, A. D. and Webster, T. B. L. 1971. *Illustrations of Greek Drama*. London. Vase-paintings, the plays and their myths.

Walton, J. M. 2006. *Found in Translation. Greek drama in English*. Cambridge.

See also Revermann–Wilson in VII above.

The General Introduction has been omitted from this edition;
the pagination for *The Children of Heracles* therefore starts on page 21.

Introduction

Ein Fremder hat immer
seine Heimat im Arm
wie eine Waise
für die er vielleicht nichts
als ein Grab sucht.
(Nelly Sachs, 'Kommt einer von ferne', *Flucht und Verwandlung*, 1959)

The Children of Heracles is a powerful and challenging tragedy of exile. At the centre of its interests stands a group of political refugees who have been driven from their homeland and shunted unwanted from state to state. Though they are finally granted protection, their presence threatens internal revolt among their allies and hostile attack from their persecutors. The arrogance of the powerful and the fragility of the powerless are depicted in the strongest terms, making for a drama of continuing moral and political relevance to the modern world. Yet until recently *The Children of Heracles* was usually dismissed by classical scholars as a second-rate work (at best), a mechanical panegyric of Athens with little emotional or intellectual appeal to a contemporary audience.

In 1882 the influential classical scholar Wilamowitz described *The Children of Heracles* as 'certainly the least impressive play that we have from him', and his negative opinion set the tone for many years to come.[1] As one scholar noted almost a hundred years later, the play was still widely regarded as 'a lifeless failure'.[2] As a result, disapproving descriptions abound in the critical literature. Grube, for example, remarks 'No one would call *The Children of Heracles* a great play. It is not

---

1 Wilamowitz (1882b) 343. Wilamowitz was himself reflecting the common nineteenth-century denigration of Euripidean tragedy, typified by A. W. Schlegel in his *Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur* (1808), who dismissed the *Hcld.* as a 'Gelegenheitstragödie' ("tragedy written to suit the occasion"): see Burian (1977) 2 n. 3. However, no less a critic than Goethe clearly saw the inadequacy of Schlegel's views and called him a 'poor herring' for his biased attack on Euripides (cf. B. Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind*, trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer (New York, 1953), 134). The Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama in Oxford lists only seven productions of the *Heraclidae* since 1781: *The Royal Suppliants* (an adaptation by John Delap, London, 1781), *Herakleidai* (Greece, 1943), *Herakleidai* (National Theatre of Greece, 1970/71/72), *Children of Heracles* (London, 1984), *Die Herakliden* (Basel, 1996).

2 Burnett (1976) 4. Fitton (1961) 460 also calls it 'lifeless'. Cf. Pearson xxv 'It must, then, be confessed that the *Heraclidae* is wanting in the highest type of dramatic interest; it is skilfully constructed but lacks depth - almost we might say vitality; it fails to probe humanity to the core.'

even a good play', and he goes on, 'Certainly, the play bears little trace of dramatic mastery.'[3] As we shall see, the most frequent criticisms concern the play's structure, characterization, and political intent. 'Admittedly, the *Heracleidae* seems a hastily written play'[4] is how one scholar avoids confronting its challenging structure, while many critics have denied the work any dissonance or complexity, reducing it to a piece of jingoistic pro-Athenian propaganda.[5]

Fortunately, however, there are some voices to be heard in the play's favour. The publication of Günther Zuntz's *The Political Plays of Euripides* in 1955 represented a notable shift from dismissal to appreciation. By viewing *The Children of Heracles* as an interesting and complex tragedy in its own right, Zuntz greatly advanced our understanding of the work, and studies of the play since then have generally been conducted in a much more positive spirit.[6] One scholar has even called *The Children of Heracles* a 'fascinating play', which 'continues to confound expectations, as it develops from a suppliant drama into a revenge tragedy'.[7] Yet despite these recent reassessments of its worth, *The Children of Heracles* is still not read or performed as often as it deserves. It is hoped that this edition will contribute in some way to the play's continuing rehabilitation.

1. Myth

(a) The Children of Heracles

The myths surrounding the children of Heracles, or Heraclidae (which also means more generally 'the descendants of Heracles'), offer some of the most interesting examples of the politicization of myth in ancient Greek culture.[8] For our purposes these myths can be treated in two distinct stages: first, the flight of Heracles' children to Athens and the city's support for the suppliants; and second, the return of Heracles' descendants to the Peloponnese. The latter stage of the myth, the return of the Heraclidae, was widely known throughout Greece. Although Euripides treated this episode in at least three other plays, *Cresphontes*, *Temenos*, and *Temenidae*, which have survived in fragments,[9] it is only briefly mentioned in *The Children of*

---

3 Grube (1941) 166, 176.

4 O'Conner-Visser (1987) 43.

5 H. R. Butts, *The Glorification of Athens in Greek Drama* (Ann Arbor, 1947) 105-6 gives a long list of 'patriotic' readings with which Butts himself agrees.

6 Cf. e.g. Burian (1977), Wilkins (1990a, 1990b, 1993).

7 E. Hall, 'The Sociology of Athenian Tragedy', in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. P. E. Easterling (Cambridge, 1997) 93-126, at 121 n. 64.

8 The best treatment remains M. Nilsson, *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund, 1951); cf. 68-73 on the Heraclidae.

9 See Harder (1985) 7-12, 201-2, 217; Webster (1967) 136-43, 252-7. Wilamowitz's proposal of a trilogy consisting of *Hcld.*, *Cresphontes*, and *Temenos* is rejected by Harder (1985) 279-80. There is no evidence for the identity of the *Hcld.*'s accompanying plays.

Heracles itself (310-11, 586-7, 875-8). Euripides has chosen to concentrate instead on the reception of Heracles' children by the Athenians, because the pro-Athenian aspects of this episode, unlike the conventionally pro-Spartan force of the Heraclidae's return to the Peloponnese, are better suited to his main dramatic purpose of engaging the attention and interest of an Athenian audience.

Before we turn to the mythical background of the Heraclidae's arrival in Athens, it will be useful to look briefly at the myth of their return to the Peloponnese since this reveals much about the adaptability of myth and its importance within Greek society.[10] According to this story, the children of Heracles, having been driven from the Peloponnese by Eurystheus, king of Argos, were led back by Heracles' son, Hyllus (cf. Diodorus Siculus 4.57-8, Apollodorus 2.8). However, Hyllus misinterpreted the Delphic oracle, who said they could return after the third harvest, and understood this to mean in the third year. He was killed in single combat by the Tegean king, Echemus, and the Heraclidae withdrew to central Greece (Hdt. 9.26, Diod. 4.58.1-5). Three generations later Hyllus' great-grandson, Temenos, received the same reply from the oracle but interpreted this to mean in the third generation. The Heraclidae then conquered the Peloponnese: Temenos took control of Argos, Cresphontes received Messenia, and Eurysthenes and Procles, the sons of Aristodemus, took Lacedaemon, thereby founding the dual kingship of Sparta (cf. Hdt. 6.52, 7.204, 8.131).[11]

According to Thucydides (1.12.3), the Dorians led by the Heraclidae conquered the Peloponnese eighty years after the Trojan war.[12] Thucydides says the

---

10 Cf. Krummen (1993) 215 'Myth - we must not forget - was for the fifth-century society not primarily a matter of literature, but experienced in reality, either in cults or aetiological tales, or, equally important, as something that structured and conceptualized reality, in this way constituting sense and giving identity.'

11 The earliest evidence for the myth dates from the mid-seventh century when Tyrtaeus urged the Spartans to obey their kings 'For Zeus himself, the husband of fair-crowned Hera, gave this city to the sons of Heracles, under whose leadership we left windy Erineos and came to Pelops' broad sea-girt land' (fr. 2.12-15 W). The descendants of Procles and Eurysthenes, the Agiads and Eurypontids, used their status as Heraclidae both to legitimize their kingship and to set themselves apart from the other aristocratic families of Sparta: see U. Huttner, *Die politische Rolle der Heraklesgestalt im griechischen Herrschertum* (Stuttgart, 1997) 43-64. For the Spartan king-lists, see P. Cartledge, *Sparta and Lakonia* (London, 1979) 341-6. The Macedonian royal family similarly exploited their Heraclid descent via Temenos: cf. Hdt. 8. 137f. and n. 9 above. One might compare the use made by noble Athenian families of their claims to heroic descent: J. Töpffer, *Attische Genealogie* (Berlin, 1889).

12 On the Dorian migration (or invasion, as it is usually called), see R. Drews, *The Coming of the Greeks* (Princeton, 1988) 203-25, and for its connection to the return of the Heraclidae, see Malkin (1994) 15-45. The archaeological and linguistic aspects are well discussed by Cartledge (n. 11) 75-101 and O. Carruba, 'L'arrivo dei Greci, le migrazioni indoeuropee e il "ritorno" degli Eraclidi', *Athenaeum* 83 (1995) 5-44. The Heraclid

Dorians came from Doris (1.107.2) and Herodotus describes them as newcomers to the Peloponnese from Phthiotis (1.56), but as the Dorians were gradually assimilated to the Heraclidae[13] they could also be seen as returning to the native land from which they had been expelled. That is, they could present themselves not as intruders but as in some way autochthonous.[14] The story of the Heraclidae's return was thus used as a charter myth for the hegemony of the Dorians in the Peloponnese.[15] Though people knew that myths could be freely invented by the poets,[16] stories like the return of the Heraclidae still had considerable ideological power and were exploited for different purposes by competing Greek communities.[17] While the myth of the return of the Heraclidae is typically pro-

---

account was only one of three Dorian myths; the other two concerned the heroes Dorus and Aegimius. Aegimius, king of Doris, had three sons, Hyllus, Dymas, and Pamphylus, who were the eponymous heroes of the three Dorian *phylai* (cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 5.69-72). As a way of connecting the Dorians to the non-Dorian Heracles, Hyllus became the son of Heracles: cf. Nilsson (n. 8) 68-9, Malkin (1994) 40, F. Prinz, *Gründungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* (Munich, 1979) 229-30.

13 Cf. J. M. Hall, *Ethnic Idenitity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge, 1997) 60 'Eventually, the Dorians and the Herakleidai were to become so well assimilated that their ethnic specificity could become confused.'

14 M. Pettersson, *Cults of Apollo at Sparta* (Stockholm, 1982) 107; Drews (n. 12) 212, 221; cf. 69n.

15 And for the hegemony of Sparta in particular: cf. Cartledge (n. 11) 343; C. Calame, 'Spartan Genealogies', in *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, ed. J. Bremmer (London, 1987) 153-86, pp. 175-7; J. Bremmer, 'Myth as Propaganda: Athens and Sparta', *ZPE* 117 (1997) 9-17, p. 13. On *anti*-Dorian sentiment in the Peloponnese, cf. A. Snodgrass, *Archaic Greece* (London, 1980) 115. The claim by the Spartan king Cleomenes to be 'no Dorian but an Achaean' (Hdt. 5.72.3) was itself probably based on descent from the Argive Heracles (cf. R. Parker, 'Cleomenes on the Acropolis' (Oxford, 1998) 5, 13): the charter myth could be adapted as the Spartans wished. Heracles' status as the foremost roving and lustful hero meant that his offspring were scattered far and wide throughout the Greek world, and they would readily invoke their descent if this would support their political or territorial aims; cf. e.g. Hdt. 5.42ff., where the Spartan Dorieus is told to settle the territory of Eryx in western Sicily on the grounds that, since Heracles was its first conqueror, it belonged by right to the Heraclids. Cf. also Thuc. 3.92-3: in 426 the Spartans found a colony called Heraclea in Trachis. As Hornblower points out (p. 503), it seems likely that some appeal was made to their ancestor Heracles' connections there.

16 Cf. e.g. [Andocides] 4.23.

17 The competition for status and success among the Greek states was of course a major factor throughout Greek history. For such 'peer polity interaction' in the archaic period, cf. e.g. C. Morgan, *Athletes and Oracles. The Transformation of Olympia and Delphi in the Eighth Century BC* (Cambridge, 1990) 2, 203-4. The power of heroic genealogies like that of Heracles is well decribed by R. Thomas, *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge, 1992) 109 'If a society sets very great store by the possession and identity of mythical ancestors, memory and tradition will attempt to record such

Spartan and probably developed in archaic Sparta[18] as a fictional legitimation of the Dorian invasion, the Athenians appropriated the myth for their own ends by developing an earlier episode in the exile of Heracles' children. The Heraclidae thus became part of Athens' own political mythology and the Athenians gained the prestige of association with Heracles, the greatest of Greek heroes.[19]

We may see this process in action if we look at the surviving literary references to the myth.[20] The earliest reference to Eurystheus' persecution of the Heraclidae comes in Hecataeus of Miletus (*fl. c.* 500, *FGrH* 1 F 30): 'Ceyx [king of Trachis] was annoyed by this [presumably their request for aid] and immediately ordered the offspring of Heracles to leave his country. "For I am not able to help you. So in order not to perish yourselves and harm me, go away to some other people."' The first reference to the children of Heracles in Attica is attributed to Pherecydes of Athens (*fl. c.* 450, *FGrH* 3 F 84). But it is Herodotus who first makes clear how the Athenians might exploit the myth for their own benefit. In his account of the preparations for the battle of Plataea in 479, Herodotus presents a debate between the Tegeans and the Athenians over who should hold the wing, a place of honour in the Greek army (Hdt. 9.25-8). In order to impress the Spartans, who are in overall command, the Tegeans recall how their king, Echemus, had killed Hyllus in single combat and saved the Peloponnese from the Heraclidae for a hundred years. The Athenians, on the other hand, stress that they alone gave shelter to the children of Heracles (from whom the Spartans are descended), and released the Peloponnese from the tyranny of Eurystheus. The Spartans, Herodotus tells us, decided in favour of the Athenians.

Attic oratory presents the myth in an invariably patriotic vein (cf. Lys. 2.11-16, Isoc. 4.54-60, 5.33-4, 10.31, 12.194, Dem. 60.8-9) and the sentiments that the mainly fourth-century orators espouse on this topic may be taken to reflect the expectations of a fifth-century audience too.[21] In other words, it is almost certain

---

ancestors, and the prestige attached to them will exert conscious or unconscious pressure upon those transmitting the traditions.' Contrast Pl. *Theaet.* 175a-b.

18 See Huttner (n. 11) 43, Prinz (n. 12) 231-2.

19 There is a parallel with the Athenians' appropriation of Heracles as a heroic prototype for (and ally of) Theseus; cf. H. J. Walker, *Theseus and Athens* (Oxford, 1995) 46-7, Parker (1996) 84-5. In the latter half of the sixth century the two heroes became ever more closely associated with one another in Attic art and myth. The frieze of the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, for example, built around 490, shows the deeds of both heroes. By connecting their local hero to such a pan-Hellenic figure as Heracles the Athenians sought to raise the status of their city and its mythology; cf. R. Parker, 'Myths of Early Athens', in *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, ed. J. Bremmer (London, 1987) 187-214, p. 187: 'In glamour and ancient renown, Athenian mythology can scarcely compete with several other regional mythologies of Greece.'

20 For the artistic evidence see §6 below.

21 In illustrating the principle that an orator should know his subject, Aristotle asks 'How

that the dominant version of the myth in Euripides' time was essentially pro-Athenian. But this does little to illuminate the detail of Euripides' particular treatment of the story. We cannot be sure exactly where Euripides has diverged from earlier tradition, but if we look at the later mythological tradition (Diodorus, Strabo, Apollodorus, and Pausanias) we find alternative versions that may throw light on Euripides' individual choices. To take three examples: some later sources name Theseus as king of Athens, not Demophon; they set the action in Athens, not in Marathon and the Tetrapolis; and finally, they have Eurystheus killed by Hyllus or Iolaus, not by Alcmene. We shall return to these differences in more detail at the relevant stages below. For now it is enough to recognize that these later mythographical accounts may preserve traditional elements of which Euripides himself was aware.

One potential source that certainly preceded Euripides' *The Children of Heracles* was Aeschylus' tragedy of the same name. However, it is by no means certain that Aeschylus' play even dealt with the same subject.[22] Fragment 73b R describes a pyre on Mt. Oeta and mentions a skin-consuming poison, and both of these features suggest action closer to Sophocles' *Trachiniae* than to Euripides' play. Fr. 74 recounts Heracles' tenth labour to fetch the cattle of the triple-bodied Geryon. Fr. 75 reads 'For I shall not suffer anything greater than this', but the statement is too vague to be tied closely to a specific Euripidean scene. There is, however, one piece of evidence which, if we accept it as coming from Aeschylus' play, might point to an episode in Euripides' work being modelled on that of his great predecessor. For Plutarch (*Mor.* 1057e-f) mentions the rejuvenation of Euripides' Iolaus and then quotes a short passage of Aeschylus (fr. 361 R): '[he changed] from a weak old man, with a buckled back and wracked with pain'. However, the story of Iolaus' rejuvenation was probably an established part of Theban tradition (cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 9.79-81 with scholia), so even if Aeschylus did mention it in his play, Euripides was not necessarily commenting on his predecessor's treatment of the episode (cf. 680-747n.). In fact, very little is known about the characters, setting, or action of Aeschylus' play, and it would be hazardous to try to reconstruct such details from presumed echoes or distortions in Euripides' work.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the myth of the Heraclidae's experience in Attica was a source of patriotic pride and that from the mid-sixth century onwards the Athenians sought to bolster the links between Heracles, his children, and Attica.[23] Euripides' play takes up this political myth and explores not only its glories but also

---

could we praise them [the Athenians], if we did not know of the naval engagement at Salamis or the battle of Marathon, or what they did for the Heraclidae, and other similar things?' (*Rhet.* 1396a6, trans. J. H. Freese).

22 The identical title proves nothing; R. Aélion, *Euripide héritier d'Eschyle* (Paris, 1983) i. 169 compares their very different *Supplices* dramas.

23 For the numerous cults of Heracles and the Heraclidae in Attica, especially in Marathon and the Tetrapolis, see §5 below.

its ambivalences. And rather than focus on Hyllus, the major figure of Heraclid myth, 'Euripides has chosen the minor members of Heracles' family for this play',[24] that is, Iolaus, Alcmene, and the children themselves. By presenting the story from their less familiar perspective he can illuminate new aspects of the myth. So let us look briefly at these figures and consider Euripides' presentation of them in relation to other works.

(b) Iolaus

Iolaus, nephew of Heracles (being the son of Heracles' half-brother, Iphicles: Pind. *Pyth.* 11.59-61), is generally portrayed in myth as the hero's younger companion and helper, accompanying Heracles on his adventures, often as his charioteer (7-8, 88-9, 215-17, 740-2).[25] He was known as a great athlete, winning at the first Olympian games (cf. Paus. 5.17.11), and was the patron hero of local games at Thebes, the *Iolaia* (Pind. *Ol.* 9.98-9, *Isthm.* 5.32-3), which took place in the gymnasium and stadium connected to the hero's *temenos* (Arr. *Anab.* 1.7.7, Paus. 9.23.1). Iolaus was worshipped not only in Thebes (cf. Ar. *Acharn.* 867) but also in Sicily and Sardinia, where he is said to have led Greek colonists after Heracles' death (Diod. 4.29, 5.15, Paus. 7.2.2). In Sicily and especially in Thebes Iolaus' cult was connected to youth, and he was seen as a hero of young men in particular (Diod. 4.24.4). Iolaus' status as a cult patron of the young is appropriate to the play's focus on the endangered children of Heracles.

Given Iolaus' close connection to heroic deeds, athletics, and youth, it is significant that Euripides has chosen in *The Children of Heracles* to make Heracles' nephew a weak old man of the same generation as Heracles' mother, Alcmene (normally his grandmother). By emphasizing Iolaus' age and presenting him as a defenceless old man, Euripides increases the hopelessness of the children's plight and prepares for the miracle of Iolaus' battlefield rejuvenation. Though Euripides is the earliest explicit source for the rejuvenation of Iolaus,[26] it is unlikely, given Iolaus' cultic connection with youth, that Euripides invented the story himself. More plausible is the idea that Euripides adapted a Theban myth of Iolaus' rejuvenation and set it on Attic soil during the battle between Eurystheus and the Heraclidae.

The earliest surviving reference to Iolaus' involvement in Eurystheus' death comes in Pind. *Pyth.* 9.79-83, which describes how, after he had cut off Eurystheus' head, Iolaus was given a hero's burial in Thebes. Interestingly, the scholia on the Pindar passage give two versions of the myth. In the first Iolaus is already dead when he learns of Eurystheus' demand that the Athenians hand over the children of

---

24 Wilkins xxii.

25 Cf. Pind. *Nem.* 3.36-7 for Iolaus at the first sack of Troy.

26 There is no compelling evidence that Aeschylus handled the myth at all in his *Hcld.* (cf. §1(a) above on fr. 361), and one should be cautious about claiming (as Gladstone (1959) 13 does) that 'Euripides is (as elsewhere) having his fun with Aeschylus.'

Heracles or face war. Iolaus prays to come back to life, kills Eurystheus, and dies again. The second version has Iolaus as an old man who prays for a second youth; once his task is complete, he dies immediately. It is obviously the latter version (that is, rejuvenation for a day rather than resurrection) that comes closest to Euripides' treatment, but the differences are still marked. Euripides is the first to tell us that the miracle occurred on the battlefield in Attica, and he does not say what happened to Iolaus after the fighting. Yet the story of Iolaus' rejuvenation not only implies that his victory over Eurystheus is divinely sanctioned, but also connects him once again to his former comrade Heracles, who had married Hebe, goddess of youth itself (cf. 851-3, 856-7, 915-16).

(c) Alcmene

Alcmene was the mother of Heracles by Zeus (210; cf. *Il.* 14.323-4, Hes. *Theog.* 943-4), who visited her in the shape of her husband Amphitryon (Pind. *Isthm.* 7.5-7, Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 69, Plaut. *Amph.*).[27] After her death Alcmene was worshipped as a heroine, particularly in Thebes (cf. Pherecydes *FGrH* 3 F 84) but also in Megara, Boeotian Haliartus and Sparta (Paus. 1.41.1, 9.16.7, 16.7). Alcmene belonged to Theban legend and was connected to Attic myth solely through her son and grandchildren. But the popularity of Heracles and the Heraclidae in Attica ensured that Alcmene was widely worshipped there as well. At Thorikos she received sacrifice with the Heraclidae, at Mounychion with Iolaus and Heracles, and in Aixone at the sanctuary of Hebe. At the sanctuary of Heracles at Cynosarges in Athens there was an altar to Iolaus and Alcmene as well as one to Heracles and Hebe (cf. 851-3n.).[28]

Euripides is the first source to attribute the killing of Eurystheus to Alcmene. Traditionally Eurystheus was killed in battle by Iolaus or Hyllus, Heracles' eldest son (cf. §1(d)), but in *The Children of Heracles* Eurystheus is taken prisoner and then executed at the behest of Alcmene. Her decision to kill him despite the protests of the Servant and the Chorus is one of the most remarkable and shocking events in the play.[29] Euripides often explores the disturbing side of revenge, frequently

---

27 Euripides wrote an *Alcmene* (probably earlier than *Hcld.*) which showed Amphitryon's anger at his wife's (unwitting) infidelity: Webster (1967) 92-4. The episode was also handled by the (Old) comic dramatist Plato in a play entitled *Nux Makra*: cf. D. Lyons, *Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Cult and Myth* (Princeton, 1997) 22. Plautus' *Amphitruo*, his only surviving mythological comedy, is adapted from a now lost Greek original of the fourth century BC.

28 See Kearns (1989) 145, Parker (1996) 313-14, J. Larson, *Greek Heroine Cults* (Wisconsin, 1995) 93, 147, Lyons (n. 27) 47.

29 Apollodorus' later version may have been influenced by Euripides' vengeful figure: Hyllus cut off Eurystheus' head and gave it to Alcmene, who then gouged out its eyes with weaving-pins (2.8.1). However, Euripides was not the first poet to associate Alcmene with revenge: in [Hes.] *Shield* 14-19 she is said to have refused to sleep with

through the experience of female characters, who are provoked by male arrogance, brutality or insensitivity: e.g. Medea, Phaedra (*Hipp.*), Merope (*Cresph.*), Hecuba (*Hec.*), Electra (*El.*), and Creusa (*Ion*). The parallels between Alcmene and Hecuba are especially striking as in each play an old woman takes vengeance on a child-killer.[30] And in both plays the gratification of passionate revenge seems inhumane. Indeed, Alcmene's conduct is made particularly disturbing to a fifth-century audience by being explicitly opposed to a law forbidding the murder of prisoners of war (cf. 961-74n.).[31] Some critics see Alcmene's turn to violence as 'carefully anticipated in [her] representation throughout',[32] but they tend to exaggerate the aggression of her initial appearance (cf. 646-53n.). Unlike Hecuba, Alcmene is not on stage long enough to present a gradual degradation towards savagery. We are thus all the more shocked by her sudden appearance as executioner and by her vengeful mutilation of Eurystheus' corpse (cf. 1050-1n.).

(d) Eurystheus

Hera, jealous of Zeus' encounter with Alcmene, delayed Heracles' birth so that Eurystheus was born first, forcing Heracles to serve an inferior master (*Il.* 19.95-133). After Heracles' death, Eurystheus continued to persecute his enemy's children, pursuing them throughout Greece (13-25, 57-8, 136-46, 189-96, 302-6, 954-6, 1000-8). According to Pindar (*Pyth.* 9.79-83, cf. §1(b) above), Eurystheus was killed by Iolaus in Thebes. In *The Children of Heracles*, however, Euripides has Eurystheus killed in Attica and also buried there, and it is worthwhile asking whether Euripides himself invented this particular Attic connection or whether it was already part of local tradition. The various accounts of Eurystheus' place of burial in later authors favour the vitality and antiquity of local Attic myth. However, before we explore the significance of Eurystheus' burial place it is necessary to consider the identity of his killer. Pindar makes Iolaus responsible and this is likely to be the oldest version (cf. Paus. 1.44.10). Thucydides says that Eurystheus was killed in Attica by the sons of Heracles (1.9), while Diod. 4.57.6-8 and Apollod. 2.8.1 have Eurystheus pursued in a chariot and slain by Hyllus.[33] It thus seems very likely that Euripides innovated here in two ways: (i) by having Eurystheus captured alive, and (ii) by having him killed by Alcmene.[34]

Amphitryon until he avenged the murder of her brothers.

30 Cf. Webster (1967) 76 'both are essentially good women driven to an act of cruel vengeance by brutality.'

31 L. Méridier, *Euripide*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1947) 194 misses the *Hcld.*'s peculiar challenge when he views Alcmene and 'Macaria' as merely flawed preparation for the 'more nuanced and more complete' Hecuba and Polyxena.

32 Falkner (1989) 127 n. 2.

33 The two later sources may have been influenced by Eur.'s version, where it is possible that Hyllus rides with Iolaus in the chariot pursuing Eury. (cf. 846-7n.).

34 As Gladstone (1959) 112 puts it, by not having Eurystheus killed in battle, Euripides

Unfortunately, our earliest sources, Pherecydes (*FGrH* 3 F 84) and Pindar, do not specify where Eurystheus was buried, though the scholiast to Pindar (*Pyth.* 9.81-3) makes the connection with Thebes explicit.[35] However, later accounts link Eurystheus with various parts of Attica, and unless these accounts derive from *The Children of Heracles* it seems reasonable to imagine Euripides drawing on something like them to shape his unique version of Eurystheus' death. Strabo 8.6.19, for example, says that Eurystheus' body was buried at Gargettus, which is not far from Pallene, the burial site specified in *The Children of Heracles* (cf. 849-50, 1030-1nn.).[36] Pausanias, however, locates Eurystheus' tomb at the Scironian rocks in the Megarid (1.44.10; cf. Apollod. 2.8.1 for his death there), and it is here that Iolaus captures Eurystheus after the battle (*Held.* 859-60). As Emily Kearns points out, a burial site in the Megarid seems more plausible for an enemy attacking from Argos, and she suggests that Eurystheus' association with Pallene may have been imposed by Euripides upon a hero-cult that already existed there.[37] Indeed, as Euripides alone mentions Pallene as the site of Eurystheus' grave, one might argue that he has entirely invented the existence of cult there.[38] But is this plausible? Can Euripides simply have invented such cults and their aetiologies? Given the traditional modes of poetic interaction with existing cult, this seems unlikely. Moreover, the impact of the play would be stronger if its closing aetiology were rooted in local Attic tradition: see 1030-1, 1040-1nn. Crucially, as Krummen observes, 'the poet was not required ... to invent cultic facts, but only to give a new interpretation of existing cultic structures.'[39]

Although Eurystheus features at more than one place in local Attic cult, Euripides is our only source for his role as a protector of Athens, and specifically as the city's saviour against the descendants of Heracles' children (i.e. the Spartans: 1032-6). So while Eurystheus may already have been transformed in local cult according to the pattern of the 'enemy hero', a hostile figure who in death becomes a community's unexpected benefactor,[40] it seems likely that Euripides has expanded his role to cover the whole of Attica and Athens in particular (cf. πόλει σωτήριος,

---

avoids an 'acceptable "straight" play'.

35 Pherecydes says simply that Eurystheus died while fighting in Attica.

36 Strabo also mentions Eurystheus' head being buried at Tricorynthus close to the spring Macaria, and this may be relevant to the identity of Heracles' self-sacrificing daugher in Euripides' play: cf. §1(f). But Euripides does not mention the tradition of the severed head (already found in Pindar). Perhaps the story of his dismemberment became popular because it granted his heroic powers of protection to two strategic places in Attica.

37 Kearns (1989) 49.

38 As does most recently F. M. Dunn, *Tragedy's End: Closure and Innovation in Euripidean Drama* (Oxford, 1996) 56.

39 Krummen (1993) 212.

40 See Visser (1982), E. Kearns, 'Saving the City', in *The Greek City: From Homer to Alexander*, eds. O. Murray and S. Price (Oxford, 1990) 323-44.

'a protector of the city' 1032). Moreover, by introducing the Spartans as a factor in Eurystheus' cult, Euripides has linked the world of the myth to that of the Athenian audience in a peculiarly striking way (cf. 1034-6n., §4).

Like the daughter of Heracles ('Macaria': §1(f) below), who dies for Athens (cf. 491, 622) as well as for her family, Eurystheus is 'a ξένος who protects Athens in war'.[41] And because he is the original aggressor he is also the more surprising saviour.[42] However, as Kearns notes, the paradox is here 'countered by predictability, for in death as in life Eurystheus remains the enemy of the children of Heracles'.[43] Moreover, as Eurystheus promises to be 'most hostile to the descendants of these children' (1034), the paradox is made especially relevant and welcome to an audience of Athenians at war with Sparta (for the date of performance, *c.* 430 BC, see §7).[44] In other words, the play should be seen as part of an Athenian mythological tradition in which Athens appropriates the heroes of other states for its own ends: the story of the Heraclidae involves Athens as well as Argos and Thebes, and Eurystheus, a former enemy, protects Athens against invasion from the Peloponnese.[45]

(e) Demophon

Demophon possessed an important heroic sanctuary at Phaleron in Attica (*IG* I^3 383.159) as well as an altar there together with Acamas (Paus. 1.1.4).[46] Acamas himself was one of the ten eponymous tribal heroes of Athens (and thus closely connected to around one tenth of the Attic population - a percentage reflected to some extent, one presumes, in the theatre audience).[47] Since having two brothers

---

41 Wilkins xxv.

42 Cf. Visser (1982) 423 'The idea that a city should worship its enemy appeared strange to the Greeks themselves: we can ascertain this from the wry and paradoxical manner in which such behaviour is described.' As Parker (1996) 38 notes 'The heroes of the classical period, in Attica above all, are of a spectacular diversity.'

43 Kearns (1989) 50.

44 Of course, the play is more than just a political endoresment of Athens, and there is enough in it to evoke diverse audience response: cf. §2-4 and P. Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths?*, (trans. P. Wissing, Chicago, 1988) 45 'Do we really believe that classical Athens was a great civic collectivity where all minds acted in concert, where the theater ratified the union among hearts, and where the average citizen could pass any test about ... the return of the Heraclidae?'

45 Compare the impact of Oedipus' burial - in Athens, not Thebes - in Soph. *OC* 455-60, 1522-35, and the pro-Athenian powers of Orestes' grave in Aesch. *Eum.* 767-71.

46 Theseus' sons are not mentioned by Homer, but appear in the Epic Cycle, freeing their grandmother Aethra from captivity in Troy (*Ilias Parva* fr. 18, *Iliupersis* fr. 4 Allen). *Il.* 3.144, which has Aethra in Troy as Helen's handmaid, is likely to be an Athenian interpolation, perhaps of the sixth century.

47 Cf. Walker (n. 19) 50, Parker (1996) 118. Intriguingly, the fourth-century deme calendar of Marathon (*IG* II^2 1358) mentions ἀκάμαντες (B, line 32) but it is

sharing a kingship could be risky (compare the feud between Eteocles and Polynices in Thebes), Demophon tends to function as successor to Theseus in Athens while Acamas establishes colonies abroad, justifying Athenian interests in Cyprus (Strabo 14.6.3) and the Chersonese (schol. Thuc. 1.11).[48] In the play this division is reflected in the foregrounding of Demophon as ruler of Athens. Acamas does appear, but he remains silent throughout his time on stage (118-352).[49] Since so little is made of his presence dramaturgically, he may have been included because the brothers were felt to be mythically inseparable in an Athenian context.

We know from later accounts of the myth that in other versions Theseus was king of Athens when the Heraclidae arrived (Diod. 4.57-8, Paus. 1.32.6). Given the importance of Theseus in Athenian mythology, it is likely that this was the dominant account. The choice of Theseus' sons enables Euripides to make significant comparisons, for just as the memory of Heracles functions as an inspiration to his children and their guardians, so too must Demophon measure his success against that of his father (cf. especially 320-8, where Iolaus says he will report Demophon's praiseworthy conduct to Theseus in the Underworld).[50] Thus both the Heraclidae and Demophon must live up to their heroic ancestry.[51] Moreover, the choice of Demophon and Acamas allows for the relationship of mutual aid between Heracles and Theseus (cf. Eur. *Heracles*) to be repeated in the next generation, albeit in a more ambivalent manner (as the future enmity of the Heraclidae to Athens is foretold, 1034-6).

(f) Maiden ['Macaria']

The Children of Heracles is the earliest surviving work to attribute daughters to Heracles (41-3, 544): the 'Heraclidae' are usually thought of as Heracles' sons. Only one of the daughters is seen on stage, the anonymous figure who offers herself for sacrifice to Kore in order to save her family and reward Athens for its support (408-9, 601). She is not named in the play, but the hypothesis (probably of the first

---

uncertain how they are connected to Acamas ('priests of Acamas'?). As Nilsson (n. 8) 52 notes, Theseus himself was originally from the Marathon area of Attica.

48 See Parker (1996) 86.

49 During this time the three speaking roles are taken by Demophon, Iolaus, and the Herald (cf. the silent presence of Pylades and Polydeuces in *El.*). Acamas probably does not return with Demophon after the first stasimon (cf. 381-607n.).

50 The pressure on young Athenian men, particularly those of the upper class, to match their father's achievements and add to the family's 'real and symbolic capital' (i.e. wealth and fame) is well discussed by M. Griffith, 'The King and Eye: The Rule of the Father in Greek Tragedy' *PCPS* 44 (1998) 20-84, pp. 31-2. But whereas Griffith (p. 29) speaks of 'cardboard idealizations of monarchical dependability such as Theseus in S. *OC* and E. *Her.* and *Supp.*', Demophon falls short of his father's perfection when he threatens the Herald with violence: cf. 271-3n.

51 Cf. Avery (1971) 546, Wilkins (1990a) 332.

century AD; see p. 131) calls her Macaria ('blessed girl') and there is independent (though late) evidence for a local Attic tradition of Macaria. Strabo 8.6.19 says Eurystheus' head was buried at Tricorynthus near the spring Macaria (though he does not make explicit a connection with a daughter of Heracles).[52] Pausanias 1.32.6 says Macaria gave her name to the spring after her death; he places it in Marathon, makes Theseus king of Athens at the time, and says that Macaria killed herself. If Pausanias is recording a local Attic myth, and if this myth was known in the fifth century, then Euripides has made some interesting changes. Most striking is the replacement of suicide by self-sacrifice; one might compare Euripides' handling of the Iphigenia myth (*IA*), where the young girl's struggle is replaced by voluntary self-sacrifice.[53]

Some scholars have argued that the daughter of Heracles and her sacrifice are entirely Euripides' invention,[54] and one could point to Menoeceus in the *Phoenissae* as a possible parallel.[55] Reversing the order of Pausanias, Wilamowitz thought the name Macaria belonged originally to the spring-nymph of Marathon and was only later attached by Hellenistic mythographers to the daughter of Heracles. As Wilkins remarks (p. xix), 'There is at least a strong suspicion that this *anonymous* daughter of Heracles, attested nowhere else in the fifth and fourth centuries, and modelled upon the saviour goddesses of the city, was created by Euripides for this play.'[56] However, since we cannot be certain of this, it is perhaps worthwhile asking: if Euripides did know of the connection between 'Macaria' and the spring, why did he not mention it or use her name? The likeliest explanation involves cult. It is normal practice for self-sacrificing hero(in)es to be rewarded with cult honours. To have named Heracles' daughter Macaria or to have mentioned the spring will have suggested posthumous heroic honours and *consolation*. Instead, Euripides presents the girl's death in starker terms, adding to the emotional economy of the scene and the pathos of her death.[57]

---

52 J. A. G. van der Veer, 'The Battle of Marathon: A Topographical Survey', *Mnemosyne* 35 (1982) 290-321, p. 291, has a map of the plain of Marathon showing the location of the Macaria spring (app. 2kms north of the Marathon trophy).

53 Cf. Larson (n. 28) 108 'The story of the sacrifice is probably a local addition to the lore surrounding [the Heraclidae], and one which would have cemented Marathon's claim to be the place of supplication.' Even if this is true, the motif of *willing* self-sacrifice is typical of Euripides (cf. *Hec.*, *Phoen.*, *Erechth.*) and may have been added by him.

54 Wilamowitz (1882a) iii-x, followed by O'Conner-Visser (1987) 37-8 among others. Zuntz 111-13, however, argues for an existing tradition; cf. Larson (n. 28) 107-9.

55 But in Menoeceus' case there is no independent evidence to suggest he predated Euripides' play: cf. D. J. Mastronarde (ed.), *Euripides: Phoenissae* (Cambridge, 1994) 28-9.

56 'Macaria' is not mentioned in the surviving sacrificial calendars from the Attic demes.

57 Heracles' daughter remains anonymous in the play and what happens to her after her death is never mentioned. At 586-9 she herself envisages her eventual burial at home in

However, whether Euripides invented Heracles' daughter and her sacrifice is ultimately a less interesting question than what he does with them in the play. *The Children of Heracles* is the earliest surviving play of Euripides to show self-sacrifice averting disaster for the individual's family or city (cf. *Hec*, *Pho.*, *IA*, *Erechth.*). Euripides clearly appreciated the emotional possibilites of such scenes, and they show his interest in exploring the pressures of war and civic crisis from the perspective of its young and innocent victims. Many myths show young people sacrificed before battle (e.g. Iphigenia: *IA*) or to save a city (the daughters of Erechtheus: *Erechth.*).[58] Heracles' daughter combines both these elements and is also unusual in not being a native of the city which she dies to protect.[59] The unexpected demand for human sacrifice means that the Heraclidae and the Athenians develop a surprising bond of mutual aid (despite Demophon's demurrals: 410-13, 464-73), and an important part of the daughter's role is to involve the children of Heracles in their own (and the city's) salvation: cf. 474-607, 500-34, 574-96nn.

(g) Herald ['Kopreus']

Like the daughter of Heracles, the Herald of Eurystheus is not named in the play. The author of the hypothesis, however, has supplied the name Kopreus derived from the myth (mythographers prefer to give names to anonymous figures).[60] It is likely that many members of the original audience could have supplied the name Kopreus themselves, as he was not an unknown figure in the myths surrounding Heracles. Homer mentions him in the *Iliad*: Hector is on the rampage, 'but he killed only Periphetes of Mycenae, the dear son of Kopreus, who had gone as the messenger of king Eurystheus to mighty Heracles. From this inferior father came a son far better

---

Argos, but no more is said of the matter. Wilkins suggests (p. xix) that Macaria may have been named and connected to the spring in some missing lines at the end of the play, but the alleged lacuna is doubtful: cf. 1052n. Equally unconvincing is the idea that the aetiology came in the supposed missing scene after 629: such aetiologies are closural devices, slowing down the action, and would be out of place in the middle of the play, especially in one so rapid in its movement: cf. §2(b).

58 In Greek myth it is typically women who perform the role of saviour in this manner. As women their intervention is unexpectedly heroic, and Euripides exploits the surprise to provoke reflection on traditional categories of heroism: cf. Kearns (n. 40) 342 "what, or who actually composes the city in these most critical moments?"

59 As Larson (n. 28) 108 suggests, this may explain her absence from the epitaphic tradition of the Attic orators, who stress Athens' exclusive role in defeating Argos and saving the Heraclidae.

60 On tragic practice cf. P. E. Easterling, 'Constructing the Heroic', in *Greek Tragedy and the Historian*, ed. C. Pelling (Oxford, 1997) 21-37, 22 n. 3 'Even minor characters, if named at all, usually have 'non-fictional' names, like Lichas in *Trachiniae*; cf. Hes. fr. 25. 22 M-W.'

in all fine achievements, both running and fighting, and among the most intelligent of Mycenaeans' (*Il.* 15.638-43). So although the Herald is not named, his identity was probably not in doubt.[61] Kopreus, who carried Eurystheus' orders to Heracles, was traditionally a far from admirable figure,[62] and Euripides exploits and develops these negative associations in *The Children of Heracles*, where the Herald is characterized as violent, devious, and without respect for the rights of suppliants (64-72, 130-1, 257-8).

2. Integrity and Structure of the Play

(a) Integrity

One factor in the poor estimation of *The Children of Heracles* has been the belief that the play had suffered 'mutilation' at the hands of an ancient director or group of actors.[63] One nineteenth-century scholar, A. Kirchhoff, puzzled by the lack of any reference to the daughter of Heracles after she leaves the stage at 601, proposed a lacuna after the choral song at 629. Filling this gap, he conjectured, was originally a report of the daughter's death (cf. *Hec.* 484-582), a lament by Alcmene, and a choral song. Adapting this line of thought, Wilamowitz argued that a fourth-century director had scrapped a scene after 629 during which the girl's death was related and mourned. Moreover, to disguise his cut, the director introduced lines 630-60 and

---

61 So why is he nameless? Perhaps his name was simply so obvious as not to need mentioning? A character's name is usually announced on his or her entry (often by the chorus), but the Herald's arrival is sudden, threatening, and unwelcome; the Chorus is not yet on stage, and Iolaus does not (politely) use his name, but calls him 'You abomination' (52). It seems unlikely that the 'low' associations of Kopreus' name (cf. κόπρος, 'dung') are the reason for its absence (Zuntz 34 n. 2, after Wilamowitz). Cf. R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume IV: Books 13-16* (Cambridge, 1992) 298 'Kopreus' name, borne by several Myc[enaean] and later Greeks, is less malodorous than it might seem: it is from κόπρος in its extended sense "cow-yard" and merely means "farmer"'. It was also the name of an Attic deme. Another version of the Heraclidae myth is recorded by Philostratus *VS* 550, in which the black cloaks worn by the ephebes of Athens commemorate their killing of Kopreus. But it is unlikely that Kopreus' name is suppressed so as to avoid recalling this incident, since his identity will have been no secret. In any case, as Wilkins (1990a) 329 n. 2 notes, 'This is not the only ancient account of the black cloaks, or even the most probable.' It is, however, just possible that the connection between Athens and the death of Kopreus was in fact prompted by Demophon's threatened violence in the *Hcld.* (270-2). In Philostratus *VS* 550 Kopreus is pulled from an altar and killed by the Athenians, just as he threatens to do to the children of Heracles in Euripides' play.

62 According to Apollodorus 2.5.1, Kopreus had killed Iphitus and fled to Mycenae, where Eurystheus purified him of the murder; cf. Parker (1983) 380.

63 Cf. e.g. W. S. Barrett (ed.), *Euripides: Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964) 46 'They [the actors] did not stop at wholesale rewriting (witness ... the mutilation of the *Herakleidai*)'.

819-22 as well as replacing Euripides' first stasimon with a song of his own (353-80)![64]

However, Wilamowitz's arguments involve a great deal of special pleading. As J. H. McLean points out, for example, 630-60 are only objectionable if one already accepts that Wilamowitz is right about the director's cut: see 630-747n.[65] As Zuntz remarks, if we take the text as it stands, we are asked to believe something 'miraculous', namely that 'after the supposed lacuna [at 630] the action proceeds exactly from the point which it had reached before it, the allegedly loose ends being entwined indissolubly.'[66] Nevertheless, in support of the idea that an important scene is missing, Lesky detected a discontinuity in the action between 607 and 630 (i.e. either side of the choral song). He argues that Iolaus has moved between 602ff., where the children set him down on the altar, and 633, where he is lying on the ground. He infers that something must have happened in between to make Iolaus fall to the ground and concludes: 'One can hardly think of any such cause other than the report of Makaria's death.'[67] Lesky, however, has misunderstood the Greek; as a result his picture of Iolaus' movements is wrong, and the missing scene remains unproved: cf. 603-4, 630-747, 633nn.[68] Finally, lines 819-22 do not in fact refer to the sacrifice of Heracles' daughter, as Wilamowitz thought, and add nothing to his theory of an interpolating fourth-century director (cf. 819-22n.).[69]

There does remain the possibility that the death of Heracles' daughter was mentioned (with much else) in a missing passage at the end of the play. A lacuna after 1052 is a good deal likelier than that after 629. However, it is not certain, and we have no way of knowing how large it was, or exactly what it contained: the various suggestions made by scholars will be discussed in context (cf. 1052n.). The end of the play as it stands is certainly abrupt, and many scholars find it intolerable that the Chorus should so casually accept Alcmene's final order that Eurystheus' body be thrown to the dogs (1050-1). Unless we amend 1050 to remove reference to the dogs (as many do), we are forced to make sense of Alcmene's savagery and to

---

64 Wilamowitz (1882b). Despite Wilamowitz's ingenuity, Grube (1941) 174 remained unconvinced, adding: 'no amount of additions or alterations can make this into a good play.'

65 McLean (1934) 199.

66 Zuntz (1947) 51.

67 Lesky (1977) 234-5.

68 Neither the hypothesis nor the five alleged fragments of the play prove that a scene concerning the daughter's death is missing. For further arguments against a missing messenger speech, cf. Zuntz 51-2, Wilkins xxviii.

69 From a theatrical perspective, it is difficult to see why a later director would be keen to delete a scene of such interest and emotional power. One can imagine choral songs going unperformed in the fourth century, but not such choice episodes. Also, if the writer of the hypothesis had access to the complete original script, as Wilamowitz and others think, why has only the director's cut survived?

interpret the Chorus' response in this light: cf. 1050-1, 1053-5nn. As we shall see, the play's end is deliberately shocking, and we should resist attempts to defuse its impact by filling the alleged lacuna with cheering words of the daughter's courage or protests from the Chorus.

(b) Structure

It is primarily uneasiness about the play's structure that has prompted scholars to posit missing scenes or major rewriting of the text by actors and directors. While many critics have taken the plot's sudden turns to be signs of incoherence or disjointedness, they are in fact part of the play's intriguing variety and contribute meaning to its strategy of surprise. Moreover, the combination of rapid movement with intensity tends to be seen as a problem rather than as a positive aspect of the play's structure. Gladstone, for example, writes: 'As so often, Euripides has tried to cram too much into one play, to move in too many directions at once'.[70] While it is true that the play contains many different elements (supplication, self-sacrifice, miraculous rejuvenation, revenge), these are not attached to each other willy-nilly, but combine to create a coherent and meaningful drama.

In fact, as Zuntz observed, *The Children of Heracles* is 'a gem of concentrated presentation'.[71] This compression is well illustrated by contrasting Euripides' handling of the supplication in *The Children of Heracles* with that of Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women*. The *Suppl.* presents the arrival and acceptance of the Danaids in a series of expansive choral songs and lyric exchanges. In Euripides' play, by contrast, 'the whole action of Aeschylus is found in the first 380 lines'.[72] Yet it immediately develops in an unexpected direction, as a new crisis prompts the daughter of Heracles to offer herself for sacrifice. Pearson comments: 'The appeal of Iolaus to Demophon and the crisis which calls for the intervention of Macaria are utilised with power and effect; but they stir us rather as separate incidents than as contributing to the development of a harmonious whole.'[73] His remarks betray a prejudice common to many critics, namely that the 'unity' of a work resides in its forming a 'harmonious whole'.[74] *The Children of Heracles* is, in a sense, 'episodic',

---

70 Gladstone (1959) 113.

71 Zuntz 27. Its brevity (1055 lines) makes it the shortest surviving (Euripidean) tragedy. This has been thought by some to lend credence to the theory of a missing scene or to support the idea that the play is merely a Euripidean stocking-filler. However, as Zuntz (1947) 50 pointedly says, 'After all, *one* must be the shortest.' (Nobody thinks to suspect *Macbeth* on these grounds.)

72 Aélion (n. 22) ii. 21. For further paraliels and contrasts between the two plays, cf. Burnett (1976) 15, Burian (1977) 4-6.

73 Pearson xxvi.

74 Cf. A. P. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived* (Oxford, 1971) 1 n. 1, who categorizes the *Held.* as a 'pageant' because 'each action is allowed to isolate itself as a discrete episode instead of being made an organic part of a truly compound plot.' The word 'organic' is as

but the sudden shifts of focus have an expressive point. Thus Pearson, like many others, fails to understand the full significance of the sacrifice scene within the play: 'After our emotions have been raised to the highest pitch by the noble self-sacrifice of Macaria, she disappears from the stage and we hear not a word further concerning her ... That the death of Macaria, one of his most pathetic figures, should be entirely ignored by Euripides is amazing, if not shocking.'[75] However, although the scene is remarkably self-contained, there is no need to presume that a report of her death has been excised or that her nobility goes unregarded (cf. 619-29).[76] In fact the disappearance of Heracles' daughter highlights the sudden shift from selfless sacrifice to selfish revenge: Alcmene enters the stage shortly after her granddaughter departs.[77]

When the supplication and sacrifice scenes are over, we expect a report of the battle against the Argives, but instead old Iolaus decides to join Hyllus and his allied forces.[78] Iolaus' 'comic' arming-scene has puzzled many critics, but its surprising tone has a purpose, for it increases the impact of Iolaus' miraculous victory (cf. 680-747n.). Finally, the most forceful dislocations are achieved at the play's end when Alcmene turns from victim to savage avenger[79] and Eurystheus is revealed as a protector of Athens. In other words, Euripides has shaped an intricate and unsettling combination plot:[80] a supplication drama leads to sacrifice, comedy is followed by retribution. To use the word 'episodic' here in a negative sense is to ignore completely the ingenuity and power of the play's structure. Rather than worry about finding a central figure (or 'hero') to give the play 'unity',[81] we should recognize that

---

subjective as 'harmonious', and it is simply assumed that both are better than the alternatives of shifting focus and surprise.

75 Pearson xxxiv.

76 As W. Schmid, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Munich, 1940) 1/3 422 observes, the structure of the sacrifice scene 'corresponds to the brevity and restraint of the lyric style of this tragedy, and is not to be criticized, even if Euripides handles it otherwise elsewhere.'

77 Wilkins xxix rightly compares the bold transition in the *Hecuba* from Hecuba's grief at Polyxena's sacrifice to her revenge upon Polymestor.

78 There is a further surprise here: Hyllus returns with a large army (664, 669), although we are told earlier that he has gone to look for an alternative refuge, not for military support (45-7).

79 Albini (1993) 110 suggests that Iolaus' positive transformation is countered by Alcmene's negative one. Webster (1967) 105 stresses more pertinently the contrast with Heracles' daughter: 'Her act of vengeance is a balance to Makaria's self-sacrifice'.

80 Euripides is particularly fond of combining several 'story patterns' in one play: see P. Burian, 'Myth into *Mythos*: The Shaping of Tragic Plot', in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. P. E. Easterling (Cambridge, 1997) 178-208, pp. 186-90.

81 As, for example, Pearson xxiii-xxiv and Stoessl (1956) 221 try to do for Eurystheus. Nor can any single theme do the play justice, despite D. J. Conacher's claims for *charis* in *Euripidean Drama* (Toronto, 1967) ch. 6, esp. 110-11; cf. 214-22n.

the play's multiple shifts of focus, and its 'shocking changes of mood and tone',[82] are deliberately geared both to enthrall and to provoke the audience.[83]

3. Suppliant Tragedy

Scenes of supplication (either at an altar, a tomb, or a divine image) play a key role in several Greek tragedies. Two features of such scenes set at an altar make them especially useful to dramatists: (i) the visual focus on the altar and surrounding suppliants makes for a compelling stage tableau and (ii) the strong religious and emotional associations of supplication create an atmosphere of anxiety and suspense as the audience waits to see the outcome of the suppliants' appeal. We shall look at the staging of suppliant scenes in §5 below, but first it is important that we consider the significance of supplication in Classical Greek society.

Supplication (or '*hiketeia*') was one of the most emotionally charged practices of Greek social and religious life.[84] The suppliant, typically touching the knees, hand, or chin of the person supplicated (cf. *Med.* 709-10, *Hipp.* 325-6),[85] might ask for help (e.g. *Hec.* 752-3, Thetis and Zeus in *Iliad* 1.498-530) or for his life to be spared (*Her.* 986-9, Lycaon and Achilles, *Il.* 21.34-135). In Homer appeals for mercy on the battlefield are never granted, but as John Gould observes, the suppliant is killed in these circumstances only when ritual contact has been broken.[86] As well as supplicating face to face, one could seek refuge at a temple, public altar, or other sacred place (such as the hearth: cf. *Hcld.* 144, *Od.* 7.153-4).[87] To harm or kill such a person would be 'a perversion of the sacred and would inevitably plunge the whole city into ruin'.[88] Moreover, 'Pollution occurs if the divinely sanctioned rights of the

---

82 Falkner (1989) 114.

83 As A. N. Michelini, *Euripides and The Tragic Tradition* (Wisconsin, 1987) 114 points out, 'Individual volatility may also be supplemented by the tendency of the plays to shift focus from one character to another, thus building a drama out of a series of contrasting and opposing human reactions, as in *Herakleidai*, where we proceed from the sturdy but ineffectual Demophon to the absurdly heroic Iolaos, and from the supramoral altruism of "Makaria" to the vengeful amorality of Alkmene.'

84 See in general Gould (1973) and F. S. Naiden, *Greek Supplication* (Ph.D. thesis, Harvard University, 2000).

85 On this gesture, which establishes ritual contact and marks the powerlessness of the suppliant, see W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley, 1979) 44-5.

86 Gould (1973) 80-1.

87 For the distinction between supplicatory contact with persons and with places, cf. G. Freyburger, 'Supplication grecque et supplication romaine', *Latomus* 47 (1988) 501-25, pp. 502-7. The choice between the two is vividly described at *Od.* 22.330-43, where Phemius ponders whether to take refuge at the altar of Zeus Herkeios or supplicate Odysseus directly.

88 Burkert (1985) 59. In vase paintings of such scenes the altars mark the savagery of

suppliant are violated in any way, not merely if they are slain at the altar.[89] However, this did not mean that all suppliants who reached holy ground were thereby assured of success and survival.[90] The Children of Heracles have supplicated at the hearths of many other cities before reaching Athens, but in each case the threat of Argive attack has ensured their rejection (15-25, 144-6).

In *The Children of Heracles* the citizens of one state come to another seeking protection, but their native city demands them back. A revealing 'historical' parallel is found in Hdt. 1.157-60, where Pactyes, fleeing the Persians, comes to Cymae, but an oracle instructs the Cymaeans to hand him back to the Persians. As it happens, the oracle is rejected and Pactyes ends up in Chios, yet there he is dragged by the Chians from a temple of Athena and surrendered to the Persians. In other words, a real-life suppliant could always be told to keep going (at his own risk) to another state, where his attempt to gain protection could be repeated.[91] No city was duty bound to accept any suppliant, no matter how deserving or upstanding he might be. So although no tragic suppliant is ever expelled from an Athenian shrine (cf. *Eum.*, *OC*, Eur. *Suppl.*), the suppliant's success is by no means a foregone conclusion, and the agreement of the Athenians marks their generosity and their acute sense of religious and moral propriety. Moreover, in *The Children of Heracles* the Athenians' concern for the rights of the suppliants contrasts forcefully with the violent and abusive Herald, a non-Athenian who ignores due Athenian process and attempts to remove the suppliants by force. Significantly, the Athenians accept the supplication of the Heraclidae in the full knowledge that this will mean war with Argos (cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 474-7, Eur. *Suppl.* 567-97). The threat of war was reason enough for any person supplicated to think twice, but Demophon recognizes a range of factors supporting their acceptance, not least the disgrace of giving way to the foreign Herald's intimidation and abuse (236-46).

Demophon's conduct is particularly admirable when we consider that the rights of real-life suppliants were especially vulnerable in times of war or civil strife. Examples of cynical deception or manipulation of the 'rules' of supplication are not

---

killing: cf. R. Osborne, *Archaic and Classical Greek Art* (Oxford, 1998) 95-6.

89 Parker (1983) 146.

90 As Naiden (n. 84) 95 puts it, 'For a century, scholars have thought that a suppliant at an altar was inviolate. In their view, the altar works like magic, as does the knee-clasp. But ample evidence belies these conclusions, and instead shows that supplication embraces religious, moral, and legal factors that make rejection not only justifiable but common.'

91 Of course, if the suppliant was a criminal or a slave, his chances of making a successful appeal were significantly reduced. As Ulrich Sinn, 'Greek Sanctuaries as Places of Refuge', in *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, eds. N. Marinatos and R. Hägg (London, 1993) 88-109, p. 92 notes, 'Athens, which prided itself on being the "bulwark for all suppliants" ... put up a police station at the entrance to the Acropolis with the clear aim of keeping undesirable suppliants away from the sanctuaries in the fortress.'

uncommon,[92] and suppliants were forcibly expelled, starved, murdered, and even burnt alive in temples (cf. e.g. Thuc. 3.81.5 on the horrors of the civil war in Corcyra in 427).[93] A number of interesting questions arise here: Should we interpret these violations as evidence of supplication's decline as a meaningful ritual in the fifth century?[94] Did fifth-century Greeks perform the kind of supplication that we find in *The Children of Heracles*? Did they see it as having a strong ritual component or was this a mere relic of a pre-state world that we find fossilized in tragedy?

If we take first the issue of the kind of supplication being performed, we see that supplication at a temple of another state was still a viable mode of petition in the fifth century (cf. Thuc. 1.24.6-7, though here the Epidamnian ambassadors at the temple of Hera in Corcyra are rejected by the Corcyraeans).[95] This suggests that the audience of *The Children of Heracles* would see a significant overlap between the events on stage and real world practices, and they would therefore have certain beliefs about the rights and rules of these situations, which would in this case incline them towards accepting the innocent Heraclidae and rejecting the aggressive and interfering Herald. Continuity in ritual practice meant that supplication retained a strong emotional and normative force in the fifth century and was far from being merely an antiquated literary idea.[96] That supplicatory ritual remained a powerful religious practice is shown not only by the history of the period,[97] but also by its

---

92 Gould (1973) 78, 82-4.

93 The flip-side to manipulation *of* suppliants is manipulation *by* them. The daughters of Danaus threaten to hang themselves from statues of the gods if their supplication is not accepted (Aesch. *Suppl.* 455-89). By contrast, there is no hint of any such behaviour in *Hcld.*

94 As Gould (1973) 101 does. Contrast Parker (1983) 185-6 'the sanctity of the suppliant remained at the end of the *fourth* century a significant constraint upon action.' (My italics.)

95 Cf. also Thuc. 1.103, 1.136-7 (Themistocles supplicates for his life at the hearth of Admetus), 3.14.1; for supplication at the temples or altars of one's own city, cf. Thuc. 2.47.4, 3.70.5-6, 3.75, 3.81, 5.16, 5.60.6.

96 Powerful concepts of pollution are not necessarily the mark of an undeveloped culture or consciousness.

97 Cf. J. Griffin, 'The Social Function of Attic Tragedy', *CQ* 48 (1998) 39-61, p. 56 'We must reflect what a small fraction we can know of the events of that crowded period, and how many such scenes we still find.' At the time of the *Hcld.*'s first production (*c.* 430), Thucydides, our most important source for the period, records the role of supplication (and its abuse) in the propaganda war between Athens and Sparta on the eve of the Peloponnesian War. In their first embassy to Athens the Spartans demand that the curse of the Spartan Cylon be driven out, referring to the murder of Cylon and his fellow suppliants on the Acropolis many years before (1.126-7). The Athenians retort that the Spartans should drive off the curse they incurred themselves when they dragged some helot suppliants from an altar of Poseidon and killed them. And they add for good measure the Spartans' sacrilegious killing of their king Pausanias, whom they had

popularity in fifth-century drama, where the plays exploit both the religious and emotional constraints of supplication and the audience's anxiety about its potential violation or rejection. In other words, the tragedies strongly suggest that 'respect for asylum was a lively issue in the fifth century'.[98]

A considerable number of surviving Greek tragedies might be called 'suppliant plays' in the sense that the action revolves around the central suppliant figure(s) and determines their future. Supplication at an altar[99] is an important part of Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women*, Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, and several Euripidean plays (*Hcld.*, *Andromache*, *Suppliant Women*, *Heracles*, *Ion*): Euripides clearly had a special liking for scenes of this kind.[100] In Aeschylus' *Suppliant Women* and Euripides' *The Children of Heracles*, *Andromache*, and *Heracles* we see various attempts to remove the suppliants from holy ground. In *The Children of Heracles* it is notable that with the early entry of Eurystheus' Herald we are plunged straight into the confrontation between the suppliants and their attacker. Demophon immediately accepts the plea for sanctuary (contrast Theseus in Eur. *Suppl.*),[101] but an unexpected crisis occurs when a human sacrifice is demanded. Unlike the *Andromache* and *Heracles*, the suppliants in *The Children of Heracles* remain at the altar throughout the play, providing a reference point for the turbulent events around them.[102]

As Donald Mastronarde observes, 'it is not by chance' that in four of the five suppliant plays which involve flight to another state the 'protecting state is Athens'.[103] Athens' defence of the suppliants, particularly of the Heraclidae and the

---

besieged in a temple and starved to death (1.128-35).

98 J. D. Mikalson, *Honor Thy Gods: Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy* (Chapel Hill, 1991) 69, who remarks on the *Hcld.* (p. 71) 'The religious issue in this play is, primarily, the inviolability of asylum itself.'

99 In Aesch. *Eum.* Orestes first embraces the omphalos at Delphi, then a statue of Athena in Athens. In Soph. *OC* Oedipus sits on a bare rock before moving to the ledge that surrounds the grove of the Eumenides. In Eur. *Hel.* the heroine takes refuge at a tomb. On Euripides' altar scenes, see H. Strohm, *Euripides: Interpretationen zur dramatischen Form* (Munich, 1957) 17-32.

100 For the general structure of such plays, see J. Kopperschmidt, 'Hikesie als dramatische Form', in *Die Bauformen der griechischen Tragödie*, ed. W. Jens (Munich, 1971) 321-46, esp. 335-7 on the *Hcld.*

101 King Pelasgus' delay in Aesch. *Suppl.* provokes the Danaids to blackmail: they threaten to hang themselves from the gods' statues if their supplication is rejected (455-67). Cf. A. H. Sommerstein, *Aeschylean Tragedy* (Bari, 1996) 137-8.

102 Cf. Rehm (1988) 304 'a group of young boys stand in the middle watching a twisted adult world unfold.' As Wilkins points out (on line 11), the *Hcld.* is unusual in being named after a group who do not form the Chorus (the only other surviving example is Aesch. *Sept.*).

103 D. J. Mastronarde, 'The Optimistic Rationalist in Euripides: Theseus, Jocasta, Teiresias', in *Greek Tragedy and its Legacy: Essays presented to D. J. Conacher*, eds. M. Cropp,

Argive mothers of the Seven, became a topos of self-praise in Athenian political oratory (cf. §1(a)). But the glorious defence of sacred rights is only one side of the myth in its tragic form,[104] and Zuntz was right to stress that the theme of supplication in tragedy offers 'more than moving scenic effects and agreeable confirmation of national pride'.[105] Demophon's decision to support the suppliants means waging war with Argos, and the Heraclidae repay the debt when the oracle makes an unexpected demand upon Athens (408-9). Thus the first part of the play shows both protector and protected working together to achieve victory. Nevertheless, there is much in *The Children of Heracles* to provoke uneasy reflection in an Athenian audience. Firstly, the play is acutely political in its presentation of the conflict between morality and power.[106] The Herald of Eurystheus challenges the divine rights of suppliants, first with violence (59-72), then with arguments of self-interest (153-78), and finally with threats of war (265-83). Secondly, and perhaps more disturbingly, Alcmene, the former suppliant, reenacts the Herald's violation of Greek *nomos* ('law' or 'custom') when she decides to kill Eurystheus, despite his being a prisoner of war (961-80). Eurystheus explicitly refuses to supplicate Alcmene for his life (983-5), but this does not make his death any less brutal or shocking, since the Athenians have already decided to spare him (cf. 964-5, 1009-10, 1026-7).

4. Tragedy and History

The Children of Heracles, like *The Suppliant Women*, was once considered to reflect the historical and political realities of its time in a peculiarly direct way. Such an approach to the Greek tragedy is typified by the work of Goossens and Delebecque, and it will be helpful to review their main conclusions.[107] Both believe that *The Children of Heracles* is a fervently pro-Athenian play, written in direct response to events at the start of the Peloponnesian War.[108] Goossens sees Euripides forced by circumstance into becoming 'un poète patriotique',[109] while Delebecque argues that,

---

E. Fantham and S. E. Scully (Calgary, 1986) 201-11, p. 203. Athens in *Eum.*, *Hcld.*, *Suppl.*, *OC*; Argos in Aesch. *Suppl.*

104 N. J. Lowe, *The Classical Plot and the Invention of Western Narrative* (Cambridge, 2000) 227 discusses *Hcld.* as a 'human-rights tragedy' along with Aesch. *Suppl.* and Eur. *Suppl.* and *Hec.*

105 Zuntz 26.

106 Compare the more overtly political debate between Theseus and the Theban Herald on tyranny versus democracy, which widens to cover Athens' policy of interfering in other cities' affairs (*Suppl.* 403-563).

107 E. Delebecque, *Euripide et la guerre du Péloponnèse* (Paris, 1951), R. Goossens, *Euripide et Athènes* (Brussels, 1962).

108 On their different dates for the play, cf. §7.

109 Goossens (n. 107) 190. However, it is hard to reconcile such patriotism with Goossens' view of the play as (216) 'strangely gloomy, monotonous and without relief'.

as war broke out between Athens and Sparta, Euripides was motivated to write *The Children of Heracles* specifically by Argive-Athenian relations at that time. Euripides, it is claimed, wanted to attract Argos as an ally of Athens, and so shaped his play to that end: Eurystheus, king of Argos, finally pledges his tomb to Athens as protection against the descendants of the Heraclidae (the Spartans), and the play thus encourages Argives and Athenians to unite against Sparta.[110] However, does such a baldly historical reading do justice to the play? The children of Heracles, for example, are portrayed throughout as innocent victims of Argive aggression. Surely this is just as relevant to our experience of the play as Eurystheus' final announcement (which is in any case motivated more by revenge than by concern for Athens).[111]

Tragedy is not a form of political propaganda, and precise reference to Athenian history is not its core concern.[112] Nevertheless, one must also beware of exaggerating tragedy's detachment from its historical context. Zuntz, for example, asserts: 'Tragedy remains invariably in its sphere; the sphere of myth, the sphere of art.'[113] Yet such an approach to tragedy risks sealing it off in a suffocating aesthetic vacuum, cut off from its cultural context. For tragedy, though set in the heroic past, is constantly exploring contemporary issues. Moreover, it is now widely appreciated that the relationship of tragedy to history is much more oblique, complex, and stimulating than either Goossens or Delebecque had envisaged.

Historical plays were rare.[114] Only one example of a 'historical' tragedy, Aeschylus' *Persians*, survives, but it is far from presenting 'pure' history on stage: it too is 'fashioned, stylized, and elaborated according to some generic conventions

---

110 Delebecque (n. 107) 83, 93. A similar view has been endorsed more recently by N. Loraux, *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, trans. A. Sheridan (Cambridge, Mass., 1986) 69 'Indeed when the tension between the two states was at its height, the orators and tragic writers did not refrain from making the moral of the story perfectly clear: composed after 430, Euripides' *Heraclidae* is simply a long indictment of Sparta'. Cf. also 305 'Aristophanean comedy tries to defuse the patriotic tirades of tragedy; as R. Goossens has shown [219-222], *The Acharnians* presents the critical, pacifist obverse of the *Heraclidae*'.

111 One should always bear in mind the variety of audience response: some spectators might see, and approve, a contemporary 'message' in Eurystheus' protection of Athens, but this does not make it the goal of the play: there are other less 'patriotic' elements involved.

112 Cf. Webster (1967) 28 'In the first part of the Peloponnesian war Euripides chose Athenian subjects for the *Heraclidae*, *Supplices*, and *Erechtheus* and the Hypothesis of the *Supplices* calls the play a "praise of Athens"; but these are only three tragedies out of eighteen which he produced from 431 to 421 B.C.'

113 G. Zuntz, 'Euripides und die Politik seiner Zeit', in *Euripides*, ed. E.-R. Schwinge (Darmstadt, 1968) 424; cf. Zuntz 78-81.

114 For the ancient evidence, cf. A. Bowie, 'Tragic Filters for History: Euripides' *Supplices* and Sophocles' *Philoctetes*', in Pelling (n. 60) 39-62, pp. 40-5.

and audience expectations'.[115] Rather than dramatize recent history as Aeschylus *Persians* does, tragedies generally deal with families and figures of the heroic past. Yet the world of the play and the world of the audience interconnect in many ways, and tragedy uses the imaginative world of myth to refelect constantly on contemporary questions. Using its heroic figures and setting, *The Children of Heracles* explores several issues of great interest to a fifth-century audience. These include the rights of suppliants, the status of Athenian and Hellenic law, the treatment of prisoners of war, and the pursuit of self-interest and revenge before justice.

The 'democratic' status of mythical Athens in tragedy (cf. *Hcld.* 34-7, *Suppl.* 404-8, 438-41) shows that the playwrights were willing to retroject fifth-century institutions and values into the heroic age. The distant heroic world of the play thus appears more familiar to its audience, inviting them to compare events on stage with events in their own society. As an ancient scholiast notes on *Hec.* 254, 'this is Euripides' custom, to attribute aspects of his own time to that of the heroes and to mix the periods together'.[116] To judge from the extant plays, Aeschylus and Euripides were much keener and more overt 'mixers' of the periods than Sophocles,[117] but the plays of all three share a more important and tangible link with history, and this is their common interest in 'dramatic confrontations, great temptations, and terrible crimes'.[118] The rights of suppliants, the conflict between justice and power: these were real life-or-death issues in fifth-century Athens.

We can appreciate how well tragedy articulates and clarifies such questions only if we see the plays within the history of their time.[119] Concern about the correct use of power, for example, is well attested in Thucydides' account of the period. During a debate in 432 on whether to go to war, the Athenian representatives at Sparta openly admit that considerations of self-interest and power override talk of right and wrong. Their amoral realism is bluntly stated: 'It has always been a rule that the weak should be subject to the strong' (1.76, trans. R. Warner). Again in 416, in the so-called Melian Dialogue, which is set out like a dramatic *agon* (or 'contest of words'), the Athenians take it as common knowledge that 'the standard of justice depends on the equality of power to compel and that in fact the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept' (5.89).

---

115 C. Pelling, 'Aeschylus' *Persae* and History', in Pelling (n. 60) 1-19, p. 1. Cf. E. Hall ed., *Aeschylus: Persians* (Warminster, 1996) 5-10.

116 Quoted in Bowie (n. 114) 45.

117 Aeschylus' concern with the 'political moment' is discussed by Sommerstein (n. 101) 391-421.

118 Griffin (n. 97) 57.

119 Cf. C. Meier, *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy*, trans. A. Webber (Oxford, 1993) 34-7, 204-16 on how tragedy explored the tensions within the Athenians' 'nomological knowledge' (Max Weber's term for a society's 'cultural assumptions and mental mappings').

As *The Children of Heracles* shows, the tragedians of fifth-century Athens explored complex moral issues, such as the conflict between power and justice, with as much insight as the historians or philosophers. For example, one question raised at the end of *The Children of Heracles* is the lawful treatment of prisoners of war. As Thucydides again makes clear (cf. 2.5-6, 2.67), this was a very important issue of interstate politics, especially during the Peloponnesian War when *The Children of Heracles* was first performed (cf. §7). Both Thucydidean examples involve Athens and her allies (the Plataeans) killing prisoners without trial. At the end of *The Children of Heracles* Eurystheus is to be killed on Alcmene's orders, but the audience are reminded that his execution violates Athenian law (961-74), and this surely coloured their attitude to the Chorus' collaboration.[120] The Athenian audience were no doubt glad to see Eurystheus defeated, and pleased that his death boded ill for Athens' future enemies (the Spartans), but some spectators will have seen more than just this.[121] For Euripides exploits the Athenian audience's anti-Spartan prejudice to raise larger questions about the legality of such killings and about the temptation to sacrifice moral values to self-interest. Here we can see tragedy directly challenging its audience to reappraise their assumptions and to review their history (both past and present) in a more critical manner. Therefore, far from being a purely 'patriotic' play, *The Children of Heracles* reflects, and engages with, history in a more complex and stimulating way. Finally, when viewed in this light, *The Children of Heracles* emerges as not merely a 'political', but also a tragic drama.

5. Setting and Staging

Rather than simply set the Heraclidae's supplication in Athens (as the Attic orators, Pausanias, and Apollodorus do), Euripides makes use of older traditions that connect Heracles and his children with the Marathonian Tetrapolis, though he does so in a way that strongly associates Athens with their rescue.[122] There is a variety of

---

120 C. Pelling, 'Conclusion', in Pelling (n. 60) 213-35, p. 234 remarks that we must 'particularly beware of the language of "subversion". The idealized, mythical Athens remains ideal ... At the end of *Heraclidae* the future may turn out in a zany way, but it is not Athens' fault, and Athens continues to reap the benefit from it.' However, he overlooks the unsettling effect of the Chorus' agreement.

121 The 'political' plays, *Hcld.* and *Suppl.*, have often been criticized as 'not tragic' because of their pro-Athenian endings. However, as Aesch. *Eum.* and Soph. *OC* make clear, it would be wrong to assume that cheering elements of this kind automatically detract from a play's tragic impact.

122 The specific references to the Tetrapolis (the four demes of Marathon, Oenoe, Tricorynthus and Probalinthus: cf. 32, 80-1nn.) do not diminish the play's pan-Attic significance. After line 81 the Tetrapolis is not mentioned again, and Athens takes over as the focus: references to the *polis* (95, 114, 157, etc.) will have made the largely Athenian audience think of their own city, not simply of Marathon. Moreover, three of the Chorus' four stasima refer to Athens (353ff., 748ff., 892ff.).

evidence to suggest that Heracles and the Heraclidae were popular figures of worship in Marathon. According to Pausanias, Marathon claimed to have been the first place to worship Heracles as a god (1.15.3, 32.4), and the hero's apotheosis is insisted upon by the Marathonian Chorus (cf. 910-18n.). Heracles had a sanctuary and gymnasium there, where every four years one of the most important Attic festivals of Heracles (the *Heracleia*) took place. Indeed, Heracles was an important cult figure throughout Attica,[123] and his popularity was shared by the Heraclidae as well, whose worship is attested in many Attic demes.[124] A decree from fourth-century Aixone, for example, mentions a priest of the Heraclidae and a priestess of Hebe and Alcmene (*IG* II^2 1199, 22-5), while a fourth-century cult calendar from Marathon includes an annual sacrifice to Iolaus (*IG* II^2 1358, col. II, line 14).[125]

There was a particular reason, however, why Euripides should select Marathon from among the many Attic demes where Heracles and the Heraclidae were worshipped. According to Herodotus, the Athenians and Plataeans had camped in the sanctuary of Heracles at Marathon before defeating the Persians there in 490 (6.108, 116).[126] Shortly afterwards, to celebrate the victory and to commemorate the hero's assistance,[127] the *Heracleia* at Marathon were reorganized and expanded to become a pan-Attic festival.[128] Marathon itself took on a special political

---

123 J. D. Mikalson, 'Religion in the Attic Demes', *AJP* 98 (1977) 424-35 describes Heracles (p. 433) as the most popular non-Olympian recipient of worship in the Attic demes. The range of major and minor Attic cults is well discussed by S. Woodford, 'Cults of Heracles in Attica', in *Studies Presented to G. M. A. Hanfmann*, ed. D. G. Mitten et al (Mainz, 1971) 211-25. In fact, Heracles enjoyed more worship in Attica than Theseus himself, a surprising fact that is 'explained' in the *Her.*, where a welcoming Theseus bestows his own future cult sites upon Heracles (1324-33); cf. Parker (1996) 168-70.

124 R. Parker, 'The Heracleidai at Thorikos', *ZPE* 57 (1984) 59 restores 'Ηρακλείδα[ις τέλεον] on a stone sacrificial calendar and remarks 'It is no surprise to find them in another east Attic community.'

125 For details of the calendar, see Whitehead (1986) 190-4; cf. 80-1n.

126 For the location of the sanctuary, cf. E. Vanderpool, 'The Deme of Marathon and the Herakleion', *AJA* 70 (1966) 319-23, *IG* I^3 1015 (Hansen, *CEG* 318).

127 Pausanias (1.15.3) tells us that the Stoa Poikile at Athens, built around 460, contained a painting of the historical battle of Marathon, which featured Heracles and Theseus as well as the eponymous hero Marathos; cf. Pliny, *NH* 35.37, D. Castriota, *Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth-Century B.C. Athens* (Wisconsin, 1992) 28-32. Athena was also shown on the painting: for her role in *Hcld.*, cf. 777-83, 920-2nn.

128 E. Vanderpool, 'An Archaic Inscribed Stele from Marathon', *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 329-37, pp. 335-6. Parker (1996) 153 mentions the possibility that the *Heracleia* at Marathon were first invented for this purpose, but it seems more likely that the Athenians appropriated a festival which already existed on a local scale. On country festivals being taken over by Athens, cf. R. Parker, 'Festivals of the Attic Demes', in *Gifts to the Gods*, eds. T. Linders and G. Nordquist (Uppsala, 1987) 137-47, pp. 139-40.

significance for the Athenians, a symbol of glorious achievement and sacrifice.[129] Moreover, the men who had died there, the *Marathonomachoi*, were the recipients of hero-cult in the fifth century.[130] Thus, by making the Chorus old men of Marathon (cf. 73-119n.), Euripides connects two of the most glorious episodes in Athens' past, the defence of the Heraclidae and the battle of Marathon.[131]

The choice of Zeus Agoraios as the supplicated god is also significant. No evidence of such a temple or altar at Marathon survives, and Euripides may have invented their existence there. In any case, what matters is the fact that it is Zeus *Agoraios* who is appealed to, rather than Zeus Hikesios, Xenios, or Soter (the god's more common titles as protector of suppliants). This is perhaps best explained by the function of Zeus Agoraios in Athens, where the god 'presided over assemblies and trials',[132] and was a 'symbol of Athenian democratic debate' (cf. *Eum.* 973-5).[133] As Wilkins says, through Zeus Agoraios the suppliants 'are appealing to the *people* of Marathon and Attica, to their democratic institutions'.[134] And in attempting to tear

---

129 J. Whitley, 'The Monuments that Stood before Marathon: Tomb and Hero Cult in Archaic Attica', *AJA* 98 (1994) 213-30 argues that the tumulus form of burial likens the Marathon dead to epic heroes (p. 229) 'whose *aretê* now serves the polis, not themselves', while he sees their aristocratic monument being (p. 230) 'collectivized, appropriated by the community as a whole for public, i.e., state, purposes.' At any rate, to judge from Aristophanes among others, some later Athenians looked back with nostalgia to Marathon as a golden age when 'the demos fought bravely for its country uncorrupted by flattery and pay' (R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record* (Cambridge, 1989) 225).

130 Cf. Kearns (n. 40) 328 n. 10 on the second-century inscription involved 'it seems inconceivable that cult did not begin [at Marathon] in the fifth century, as with the dead at Plataea (Thuc. 3.58.4).'

131 Like the suppliant children of Heracles, the Marathonian Chorus are also present on stage throughout the play, affecting the audience's response to the threat of invasion.

132 L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford, 1896) vol. 1, 58. There was an altar of Zeus Agoraios on the Pnyx, the meeting place of the Assembly, as well as in the Agora.

133 Wiles (1997) 193; cf. Mikalson (n. 98) 258 n. 20.

134 Wilkins 60; cf. 70n. Such associations can work without the audience necessarily understanding Zeus Agoraios as the god of their own market place in Athens (as he is in Ar. *Knights* 410, 500). Nevertheless, V. J. Rosivach, 'The Altar of Zeus Agoraios in the "Heracleidae"', *La parola del passato* 33 (1978) 32-47 sees Euripides (44) 'purposely confusing the altar upon which the suppliants seek refuge from the Argives with the cult site [of Zeus Eleutherios in the the Athenian agora, built *c.* 430] which announces Athens' independence from foreign control.' However, such a leap seems rather forced: the Heraclidae are plainly supplicating Zeus Agoraios in Marathon, not Zeus Eleutherios in Athens. Although later tradition does locate the Heraclidae's supplication in Athens, the sources mention the Altar of Pity in the agora, not the altar of Zeus Agoraios; cf. Wiles (1997) 195 with n. 23. For Zeus' role in the play, cf. 238-9, 387-8,

them away from the protection of such a god, the Herald shows his contempt for the democratic liberties of Athens.[135]

Thus Iolaus and the sons of Heracles have sought refuge at the altar of Zeus Agoraios in Marathon (32, 70). Behind them is the god's temple, where Alcmene guards Heracles' daughters (41-3), and close by is the palace of Demophon and Acamas (340-3).[136] According to Athenian tradition, Theseus unified the whole of Attica under Athenian hegemony in the previous generation (cf. Thuc. 2.15.2, Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 94). In *The Children of Heracles*, however, Demophon and Acamas have their palace at Marathon, and their control of Attica radiates from there. Yet, although the play is located in north-east Attica, the frequent references to Athens (e.g. 38, 69, 198, 359-60, 387, 777-83, 934) blur the distinction between the two locations, as well as the distiction between Athens and Attica as a whole (cf. 32n.).[137]

Like several other plays of Euripides, *The Children of Heracles* is set before a temple (cf. *Suppl.*, *Ion*, *IT*),[138] represented by the *skene* building, whose single central door provides a strong visual focus for entrances and exits. The children of Heracles remain at the altar of Zeus Agoraios throughout the play, even after Iolaus leaves for battle (747). In suppliant scenes of this kind two particularly interesting questions of stagecraft arise: (i) Was the Athenian stage separated from the orchestra by being on a slightly higher level? and (ii) Where was the suppliants' altar located - on the stage (if it existed) or further forward in the orchestra?

(i) Whether a 'low stage' existed between the *skene* and the orchestra in the classical period is a deeply controversial issue. Rush Rehm has argued that 'We have no archaeological evidence for a stage separate from the orchestra, nor for an altar

---

695-7, 718-19, 766-9, 851-3, 867-70, 936-7, *RE* Suppl. XV (1978) 1299-1300.

135 According to Hdt. 5.46, Euryleon, the deposed Spartan tyrant of Selinus in Sicily, sought sanctuary at the altar of Zeus Agoraios, only to be killed by the townspeople.

136 For a possible on-stage statue of Zeus, cf. 786-7n.

137 At 69ff. Iolaus invokes the Athenians: the distance between Marathon and Athens is collapsed (cf. Sommerstein on Ar. *Clouds* 138 for similar effects in comedy). Thus the audience can accept Athens being defended against an Argive army at Marathon, which was not on the usual route for invaders from the Peloponnese. Besides the blurring of space (cf. Athens and Colonus in Soph. *OC*), there is also blurring of time (that of myth and the present): Demophon and Acamas rule over a *democratic* Attica (34-6). Both blurrings draw the fifth-century Athenian audience into the action. Cf. Wiles (1997) 217 on a similar process in the *Hipp.* 'With the arrival of Theseus, the setting seems to melt from Troezen into the real space of performance, Athens'. As Wiles (1997) 194 observes, 'In *The Children of Heracles* the use of space is schematic, and does not in any realist sense portray a single location. Athens, the deme *agora* and the temple of Heracles [at Marathon] are all evoked by the placing of the action around an altar.'

138 The altar of Zeus Soter in the *Her.* stands in front of Heracles' house at Thebes.

located on it, in the fifth-century theater of Dionysus.'[139] He thereby challenged a view that had prevailed in dramatic scholarship for over a century and his article stands as a salutary provocation to the then (and perhaps still) current orthodoxy. While a removable vertical *skene* is beyond argument,[140] one wonders why the dramatists should impose a *low* temporary structure on what was before Pericles' day a flattened area.[141] But even if there was a low stage, there was always free movement between the stage and the orchestra, and the dramatist was free to utilize the stage or to ignore it as much as he wished. For in the suppliant plays (Aesch. *Suppl.*, Soph. *OC*, Eur. *Hcld.*, *Suppl.*, *Her.*), as we shall see, it was the orchestra, not the stage, which formed the central acting area for much of the action. Moreover, we should always be open-minded about the use of space and not insist that because things were probably done with a stage in X, they must have been done with one in Y. The crucial factors were always the available space and how it might best be utilized.[142] Play-scripts were being produced in all sorts of theatres throughout the Greek world, and there was no single absolutely right way of performing them.

(ii) The position of the altar used in many suppliant plays is almost as controversial as the issue of the stage. The suppliant scene, with anxious figures crowded together on holy ground, provided a gripping and effective scenic tableau. Rehm argues that 'the altar used in suppliant plays was usually, perhaps always, located in the center of the orchestra.'[143] David Wiles has also argued that the sacred connotations of the orchestra centre are appropriate to the staging of suppliant plays there: 'the site of the *thymelê* at the centre of the *orchêstra* is already imbued with a religious charge and the focus of the theatre makes this the natural place to site the tomb or suppliant's altar required in so many plays.'[144]

---

139 Rehm (1988) 265.

140 On the temporary stage-building, see J.-C. Moretti, 'The Theater of the Sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus in Late Fifth-Century Athens', *ICS* 24-25 (1999-2000) 377-98, pp. 396-7.

141 A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Theatre of Dionysus in Athens* (Oxford, 1946) 57-9, 69-74 demolished the view that a stage was necessary to help the audience distinguish the actors from the chorus.

142 Thus we should also recognize flexibility in the shape and use of the orchestra. Even if the theatre in Athens had a circular orchestra (questioned by Moretti (n. 140) 386), and even if this shape became canonical for the large stone theatres of the fourth century, it was not possible everywhere, as the rectangular or trapezoidal spaces of the theatres in the Attic demes of Thorikos, Ikarion, and Peiraeus make clear. Director, actors and chorus would utilize the space as they saw fit and the lack of a clearly defined circle was hardly a serious problem; after all, dancing in a circular (or rectangular) formation was not the be all and end-all of tragedy.

143 Rehm (1988) 264. The altar itself was a movable piece of stage furniture rather than a permanent fixture.

144 Wiles (1997) 188. However, I hesitate to agree with Rehm that the altar was 'perhaps always' located in the centre of the orchestra. As J. P. Poe, 'The Altar in the Fifth-

People rather than objects are generally the focus of attention in Greek tragedy,[145] but in the suppliant plays people are connected to objects like tombs and altars in peculiarly powerful ways. In *The Children of Heracles* the altar is a refuge for numerous suppliants, and this suggests a fairly large monument well forward of the *skene* door.[146] Moreover, Eur. *Suppl.* opens with Aethra surrounded at the altar by the Chorus of Argive mothers, while Adrastus and the sons of the Seven lie before the temple of Demeter (i.e. the *skene*). In terms of stagecraft, then, the opening suppliant tableau of *The Children of Heracles* and *Suppl.* would be well served by having an altar in the orchestra. But even when the orchestra is the focus of the audience's attention for the first part of the play (as in the suppliant tragedies), this does not stop the focus moving back to the stage. In *Choephoroi*, for example, the tomb of Agamemnon in the orchestra dominates the first half of the play, but when Orestes and Pylades reenter in disguise, the focus moves to the palace (door) and so away from the orchestra to the (back of the) stage (653ff.).[147]

The *eisodoi* (or 'entrance ways') on either side of the acting area have a variable identity, which is determined by the action of the individual play. It seems reasonable to follow Taplin and Wiles in assuming that 'in suppliant plays generally one *eisodos* leads to the safety of a receiving city and the other leads to danger.'[148] Moreover, we can be sure that each *eisodos* was used consistently once its identity had been established. If we ask ourselves which side (left or right) was more suited to safety or to danger, the answer must be speculative. Nevertheless, by analyzing the uses of left and right in Greek thought, Wiles has argued that 'The opposition of wilderness (= audience left) versus civilization (= audience right) is ... a characteristic device of Greek culture.'[149] If we apply this idea to *The Children of Heracles*, we will see the left *eisodos* leading to Argos and Eurystheus' army, and the right leading to Marathon.

Century Theater', *CA* 8 (1989) 116-39 suggests, the altars and tombs of the suppliant plays would themselves be placed to suit the dramatic needs of the individual play. Moreover, productions outside Athens would have to deal with many different shapes of theatre and orchestra.

145 This is not, however, to deny the importance of significant objects like Heracles' bow in *Phil.* or Orestes' urn in Soph. *El.*

146 As in real life, the altar of Zeus Agoraios is in front of his temple (represented by the *skene*).

147 The wooden *skene* was probably painted to look like a permanent stone structure, schematic enough to serve equally well as a temple, a house, or a palace (the scenes of most surviving plays). Although it is very unlikely that the backdrop could be repainted or replaced between plays, unusual settings like the cave of Soph. *Phil.* could have been hinted at by simply adding some foliage, rocks, and the like, to the basic set.

148 Taplin (1977) 450-1, Wiles (1997) 134 (quotation from here).

149 Wiles (1997) 144.

Thus, starting from the opening tableau of Iolaus and the Heraclidae at the altar, the play's entrances and exits might be arranged as follows: **47**: enter Herald (from left). **73**: enter Chorus (from right). **118**: enter Demophon and Acamas (from right). **284**: exit Herald (to left). **352**: exit Demophon and Acamas (to right). **381**: enter Demophon (from right). **474**: enter Maiden (from *skene* temple). **602**: exit Demophon and Maiden (to right). **630**: enter Servant (from left). **646**: enter Alcmene (from *skene* temple). **701**: exit Servant (into *skene* temple). **720**: enter Servant (from *skene* temple). **747**: exit Iolaus and Servant (to left). **784**: enter Messenger (from left). **891**: exit Messenger (to left). **928**: enter Servant(s) and Eurystheus (from left). **1055**: exit Eurystheus and Servant(s) (to left), Chorus (to right), Alcmene and the children (into *skene* temple). Eurystheus' final exit is to his death, and so probably leftwards in the direction of war and savagery. This minor point of stagecraft is a further indication that the close of the play is not so purely optimistic or patriotic as some may think (cf. 1053-5n.).

In Attic tragedy all speaking parts were distributed between three actors, which meant both that an actor often played more than one role, and that the same role occasionally had to be divided between two or more actors (the use of separate masks for each character no doubt helped here). If the first actor in *The Children of Heracles* played the major roles of Iolaus and Eurystheus,[150] the remaining roles can be divided in various ways, but the most satisfactory and economical (in terms of movement) is for the second actor to play the Herald, the Maiden, and Alcmene, while the third actor plays Demophon, the Servant, and the Messenger. The children of Heracles are played throughout by silent extras (κωφὰ πρόσωπα); so too is Acamas, since the three speaking actors are already required to play Iolaus, the Herald, and Demophon (118-352; cf. §1(e)).

6. The *Heraclidae* in Art

The relationship between tragedy and iconography, that is, between text and image, is now acknowledged to be far more complex and oblique than was previously thought. The old 'philodramatic' school tended to think of the vase-painter producing snap-shot illustrations of specific plays, but in recent years 'iconocentric' scholars have questioned such an approach; they stress instead that the painters were far more influenced by the pictorial traditions of their own craft than by the textual or performance traditions of the theatre.[151] In fact, some scholars argue that the vase-

---

150 C. W. Marshall, 'The Rule of Three Actors in Practice', *Text and Presentation* 15 (1994) 53-61, p. 57, accepts such an assignment on the principle of 'thematic significance', which occasionally leads to the same actor taking antithetical roles.

151 The two schools are described by L. Giuliani, 'Rhesus between Dream and Death: On the Relation of Image to Literature in Apulian Vase-Painting', *BICS* 41 (1996) 71-86, pp. 72-4. However, as Giuliani shows, there is something of value in both approaches, and problems arise when one method is pursued exclusively. Thus, the first approach (p.

painters' focus was simply on 'the myth', not on any particular literary treatment of it.[152] However, as Oliver Taplin points out, 'this is to react too far against the old over-literary approach'.[153] For many scenes depicted on South Italian vases from the late fifth century onwards *are* connected to tragedy, albeit in a far less direct way than was once thought: the viewers generally do not get a direct representation of a particular text or performance, or even of a specific scene, but a knowledge of tragedy would add significantly to their reading of the images.[154]

Besides being interesting works of art in their own right, these vases are important evidence for the spread of tragedy beyond Athens.[155] Despite the plays' Athenian origins, they were clearly being enjoyed in many different communities from an early date.[156] Importantly for us, two of these South Italian vases relate to *The Children of Heracles*. The first, a pelike from Heraclea (modern Policoro), is dated *c.* 400 BC.[157] It shows the confrontation between Iolaus and the Herald of Eurystheus from the opening scene of the play. Trendall remarks that 'the scene would fit in well with lines 48-50 of the *Herakleidai* of Euripides.'[158] The second vase, a column-krater from the late fifth century, was also found in Heraclea.[159] It shows the same confrontation as the first vase, but here the Herald has actually laid hold of Iolaus, while Alcmene is also depicted along with the arrival of Demophon and Acamas.

---

85) 'is quite right to emphasise the literary character of the iconography, but ... it underestimates the vase-painters' active role and regards the images merely as a passive mirror of literary creations.' Meanwhile, the 'iconocentric' position (p. 85) 'threatens to deprive the images of their confrontation with literature; a confrontation by which the iconographic patterns are constantly varied, opened, and changed.'

152 E.g. Giuliani (n. 151) 85 himself.

153 O. Taplin, 'The Pictorial Record', in Easterling (n. 7) 69-90, p. 80.

154 Cf. Taplin, *Comic Angels* (Oxford, 1993) 22-7. The vase-painters do not produce visual versions of texts, but as A. D. Trendall remarks (*Red-Figure Vases of South Italy and Sicily* (London, 1989) 262), they 'probably drew their inspiration from an actual performance which remained in their memory and influenced the representations on the vases.'

155 The South Italian vases, which are mainly fourth-century, show a marked preference for scenes from Euripidean tragedy.

156 We know that Aeschylus, for example, was already producing tragedies in Sicily in the 470s; cf. Sommerstein (n. 101) 20-2.

157 = *LIMC*, 'Herakleidai' 2, A. D. Trendall and T. B. L. Webster, *Illustrations of Greek Drama* (London, 1971) III. 3, 20. The central section of the image is depicted on the front cover of this book.

158 Trendall (n. 154) 22. The Policoro Painter depicted another scene with marked theatrical links (to the finale of Euripides' *Medea*): cf. Taplin (n. 154) 16-17.

159 *LIMC*, 'Herakleidai' 3; Trendall and Webster (n. 157) 87 suggest that the two vases, which are similar in style, may have come from the same workshop.

If these vases relate to Euripides' version of the myth, they suggest that *The Children of Heracles* was performed in or near Heraclea before the end of the fifth century. This is interesting not only for what it reveals about the early spread of Attic tragedy in the Greek West, but also for what it tells us about the play itself. For we see one of Euripides' most Attic plays being enjoyed by a non-Athenian audience, suggesting that there is much more to the play than mere pro-Athenian propaganda. Also, the fact the vases were found in Heraclea suggests a mainly Heraclean audience, who would arguably be more interested in the depiction of their ancestors, the Heraclidae, than in the glorification of Athens.[160] If their reading of the play was 'political', the politics involved will have been very different from those operating in Athens. As I have argued elsewhere,[161] the Heracleans' enjoyment of this particular tragedy was linked to their sense of themselves as descended from heroic Greeks, while the wider popularity of tragedy in the Greek West was closely related to its role there as a marker of Greek culture and identity. The vases thus offer an intriguing glimpse into the cultural mechanisms of tragedy's early reception beyond Athens, while at the same time reminding us that there is more to plays like *The Children of Heracles* than mere pro-Athenian politicking.

7. The Date of the Play

Nine of Euripides' surviving plays are more or less securely dated by references in the hypotheses and scholia: *Alcestis* (438), *Medea* (431), *Hippolytus* (428), *Trojan Women* (415), *Helen* (412), *Phoenissae* (between 411 and 409), *Orestes* (408), *Bacchae* and *Iphigenia at Aulis* (between 408 and 406, the year of Euripides' death). For the remaining plays, including *The Children of Heracles*, we must rely on the internal evidence of style and metre. The verse of spoken dialogue in tragedy is the iambic trimeter, and as his career develops Euripides' iambics show a greater tendency to resolution (two light syllables replacing a heavy): thus, roughly speaking, the higher the proportion of resolutions to trimeters, the later the play. If we correlate the plays of known date with the others in respect of resolutions and other metrical features, we can build up a fairly reliable chronological sequence, in which *The Children of Heracles* comes shortly after the *Medea* of 431.[162]

---

160 Heraclea was founded in 433/2 BC. The fifth-century historian Antiochus of Syracuse (*FGrH* 555 F 11) says that although it was initially a joint venture between Taras (an old Spartan colony founded in the late eighth century) and Thurii (a mainly Athenian colony founded in 444/3), the pro-Spartan Tarentines soon took control of the foundation, moved it to a new site, and changed its name to Heraclea.

161 W. Allan, 'Euripides in Megale Hellas: Some Aspects of the Early Reception of Tragedy', *G&R* 48 (2001) 67-86. For a full bibliography and various articles on Athens and the Western Greeks in the late fifth century, see *Ostraka* 6 (1997) 87-178, 309-452. A fascinating history of Heraclea into the Roman imperial period is given by F. Sartori, 'Eraclea di Lucania', in B. Neutsch (ed.), *Herakleiastudien* (Heidelberg, 1967) 16-95.

162 M. Cropp and G. Fick, *Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: The Fragmentary*

Several scholars have attempted to supplement the metrical evidence by looking for specific historical allusions in the play.[163] Diodorus Siculus (12.45) and a scholion to Soph. *OC* 701 say that the Spartans spared the Tetrapolis in 430 because of its acceptance of their ancestors, the Heraclidae.[164] Meanwhile, Thucydides reports that in the summer of 427 the Spartans invaded parts of Attica which they had so far left untouched (3.26.3).[165] Combining these sources, Wilamowitz argued that the play must have been performed before the summer of 427 when the protection of Eurystheus' tomb failed,[166] and elsewhere he regards both 429 and 427 as possible dates.[167] According to Zuntz, however, we cannot be certain that the Tetrapolis was in fact devastated in 427 (cf. Hdt. 9.73.3: Decelea is spared by the Spartans throughout the war because of an ancient benefit). More importantly, he points out that Eurystheus' protection is intended for the whole of Attica, not just part of it.[168] If, then, as appears to be the case, Eurystheus is most

---

Tragedies (*BICS* Supplement 43, London, 1985) 5 calculate the resolutions as a percentage of trimeters: *Alc.* 6.7, *Med.* 7.3, *Hcld.* 7.6, *Hipp.* 6.1, *Andr.* 15.9, *Hec.* 19.8, etc. On these figures alone the *Hcld.* may appear to come just after the *Hipp.* of 428, but other metrical features suggest a date before the *Hipp.* and closer to the *Med.*: cf. E. B. Ceadel, 'Tragic Trimeters in Euripides' *CQ* 35 (1941) 66-89, p. 74. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that no date between 430 and 426 would in itself be statistically impossible: see Cropp and Fick, p. 23.

163 However, the alleged allusions are not convincing. Spranger (1925) 118, 123, for example, sees 419 as the year best suited to its performance. He arrives at the date by arguing (somewhat implausibly) that the play is favourable to Argos and was intended to endorse the alliance between Athens and Argos made in 420 (Thuc. 5.43-7). Paley 323, on the other hand, suggests 418 on the grounds that the play 'was designed to foment the popular indignation against the treachery of the Argives' (cf. Thuc. 5.76-81). By contrast, Delebecque (n. 107) 93, who also regards the play as a covert appeal to Argos, suggests that it was written late in 430 and then performed as soon as possible at the Lenaea in January 429. Gladstone (1959) 111-12 sees Euripides reacting hurriedly to the execution without trial of certain captured Peloponnesian envoys (Thuc. 2.67.4, Hdt. 7.137.3). According to Gladstone, Euripides rushed his composition in time for a spring performance in 429, hence the 'carelessly composed ending'. However, the play's ending is not so badly written, and Eurystheus is not a strong parallel to the executed messengers: unlike them, he is given the chance to speak and his life is spared by the leaders of Athens at any rate.

164 Cf. Nilsson (n. 8) 70.

165 However, Thucydides says elsewhere that *all Attica* was ravaged in the invasion of 430 (2.57.2).

166 Wilamowitz (1882a) xv.

167 Wilamowitz, *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin, 1875) 152, 175. By contrast, Goossens (n. 107) 108-9 thinks the play was written in 426 or 425 as a *reaction* to the sack of Marathon in 427.

168 Zuntz 84-5. In support of Zuntz, one might note that Eurystheus is to be buried in Pallene (1030-1), which is closer to Athens than to Marathon. Krummen (1993) 216

naturally understood as referring to the whole of Attica (1032-6), Zuntz may be right to support a production in the spring of 430, before the Spartans' major invasion of that year: 'The prophecy could not have been uttered after 430 B.C.: it presages the failure of the coming Spartan invasion: how could it possibly have been proposed to an audience still smarting from it!'[169]

Therefore the combination of metrical evidence and Eurystheus' optimistic prophecy appears to support a date before the summer of 430, when the Spartans penetrated as far as Pallene and the plague broke out in Athens. 430 would thus seem the likeliest year of production.[170] However, since one cannot be absolutely certain of the date, one should be wary of basing an interpretation of the play, or its parts, on the specific events of any given year. While it is certainly relevant that Athens was (probably) already at war with Sparta when the play was first performed, the goal of the play is not to allude to the details of a particular invasion.

8. The Transmission of the Text

Our medieval manuscripts of tragedy derive ultimately from the first scholarly editions of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides made in the third century BC at the great Library of Alexandria.[171] The scholars of Alexandria had access to the official Athenian copies of the plays which the statesman Lycurgus had ordered to be made *c.* 330.[172] If Lycurgus was motivated by a desire to protect the plays against changes being made by actors and producers, this suggests that different versions of the texts

---

notes that both the *Hcld.* and the *Suppl.* 'strikingly present us with a religious fortification of the countryside, which suggests a date in the first third of the war'.

169 Zuntz 85-6. As Pearson xxxi notes, 'In 431 [the Spartan king] Archidamus advanced as far as Acharnae, but retired without extending his ravages to the south or east of Athens.' D. M. Lewis, *CAH* V 394 calls the invasion of 431 'a very restrained campaign'.

170 Any year in the late 430s is more or less conceivable, except 431, the year of the *Medea* tetralogy whose play-titles are known. If it were performed before 431, Eurystheus' prophecy might then be interpreted (in an atmosphere of mounting tension and hostility between Athens and Sparta) as looking forward to the first Spartan invasion of 431: cf. 1034-6n. Nevertheless, it does seem unlikely that this plot would have been topical before hostilities began. As to the *Hcld.*'s companion plays, we have no secure evidence: cf. n. 9.

171 Aristophanes of Byzantium (*c.* 257-180 BC), who was head of the Library from *c.* 194, is widely credited with the first editions of Greek drama. He prefaced each play with a brief hypothesis containing valuable didascalic information on the original production (e.g. date, place in the competition, companion plays), but in the case of the *Hcld.* such information is lost and we are left with a much later hypothesis that is little more than a pedestrian (and at times inaccurate) summary of the action (cf. p. 131).

172 Ptolemy II (308-246) had borrowed the standard Athenian copies for the Library but never gave them back, preferring to forfeit his deposit of fifteen talents (Galen, *Commentary on the Epidemics of Hippocrates*, 2.4).

were being circulated and performed in the fourth century, and we have no way of knowing how far these alternative versions influenced Lycurgus' Athenian editions[173] or those of the Alexandrians. Nevertheless, Wilamowitz's arguments for substantial revision of *The Children of Heracles* in this period are not convincing (cf. §2(a) above). Nor do the alleged quotations from the play provide evidence of a version substantially different from the one we have (cf. pp. 225-7).

In the Alexandrian period it seems that ninety-two plays were ascribed to Euripides (of which four were regarded as spurious).[174] The Alexandrians themselves probably possessed copies of around seventy five Euripidean plays, but in the following centuries a gradual process of selection significantly diminished the number of tragedies in general circulation. By the end of the third century AD ten plays of Euripides were being read more widely than any others: *Hecuba*, *Orestes*, *Phoenissae*, *Hippolytus*, *Medea*, *Andromache*, *Alcestis*, *Rhesus*, *Trojan Women*, *Bacchae*. Wilamowitz suggested that in the second century AD someone had deliberately selected these plays for school use and written a commentary to accompany them. However, as W. S. Barrett has shown, there is no way of knowing 'how far that process [i.e., the gradual preeminence of these ten plays] was crowned by a deliberate act of selection'.[175] At any rate, these 'select plays' (with the exception of *Bacch.*) are the only ones preserved in our earliest manuscripts from the eleventh century onwards.[176]

The survival of the other nine plays, including *The Children of Heracles*, depends on a single early fourteenth-century manuscript (L), which 'was brought to Italy by its owner, Simon Atumanus, Bishop of Gerace in Calabria, in or before 1348; subsequently it passed into the Laurentian collection at Florence, where it now is' (Cod. Laur. 32. 2).[177] These nine plays (preserved without scholia) are *Hel.*, *El.*,

---

173 One factor which may have led to a more accurate preservation of the original Athenian texts was that Lycurgus could call on the scripts preserved by the (theatrical) families of the major tragedians, who presumably would have been eager to preserve the actual words of their famous ancestors.

174 In the *Suda* (cf. D. Kovacs, *Euripidea* (Leiden, 1994) 13) Euripides is said to have competed at the Great Dionysia in Athens on twenty-two occasions (= 88 plays, 66 tragic, 22 satyric or pro-satyric).

175 Barrett (n. 63) 53.

176 All of these plays (apart from *Bacch.*: cf. Barrett (n. 63) 51 n. 3) have survived with scholia, marginal or interlinear annotations, some of which may derive from ancient commentaries reaching as far back as Aristophanes of Byzantium himself.

177 E. R. Dodds (ed.), *Euripides: Bacchae* (2nd edn, Oxford, 1960) liii. L in fact contains nearly all the surviving plays (without scholia); it lacks *Tro.* and has only *Bacch.* 1-755. All the plays are found in P (another closely related fourteenth-century manuscript), but in the case of the 'alphabetic' plays P is a copy of L: see Diggle (1994) 298-304, building on the discoveries of G. Zuntz, *An Inquiry into the Transmission of the Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge, 1965).

Hcld., *Her.*, *Suppl.* [*Hiketides*], *IA*, *IT*, *Ion*, and *Cycl.* They are usually referred to as the 'alphabetic' plays because they begin with the Greek letters E, H, I, and K, and they appear to have survived by complete accident from an ancient collection of Euripides' work arranged in more or less alphabetical order. In them we appear to have a random sample of Euripides' plays, free from the selection process undergone by the other ten.

The text reprinted here is that of the recent Oxford Classical Text of Euripides, edited by James Diggle (Vol. I, Oxford, 1984). I am grateful to both editor and publisher for permission to reprint.[178] I disagree with Diggle's text in only a few places and these are discussed in the commentary (cf. esp. 1014-15, 1052nn). The *apparatus criticus* at the foot of the Greek text is a highly selective (and translated) version of Diggle's,[179] offering essential information about only the most doubtful passages. Those wishing to see the full range of manuscript evidence and scholarly emendations should of course consult Diggle's apparatus. In accordance with the aims of this series, the translation does not aim at elegance or performability, but attempts above all to make clear my interpretation of the Greek.

---

178 With four minor corrections: see Diggle's OCT Vol. III (Oxford, 1994), *Addenda et Corrigenda in Tomis I-II*, p. 480.

179 Some scholars' emendations in *Hcld.* have been reattributed by Diggle (1994) 519.

THE CHILDREN OF HERACLES

ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΩΝ

ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΩΝ

Ἰόλαος υἱὸς μὲν ἦν Ἰφικλέους, ἀδελφιδοῦς δὲ Ἡρακλέους· ἐν νεότητι δ' ἐκείνωι συστρατευσάμενος ἐν γήραι τοῖς ἐξ ἐκείνου βοηθὸς εὔνους παρέστη. τῶν γὰρ παίδων ἐξ ἁπάσης ἐλαυνομένων γῆς ὑπ' Εὐρυσθέως, ἔχων αὐτοὺς ἦλθεν εἰς Ἀθήνας κἀκεῖ προσφυγὼν τοῖς θεοῖς ἔσχε τὴν ἀσφάλειαν Δημοφῶντος τῆς (5) πόλεως κρατοῦντος. Κοπρέως δὲ τοῦ Εὐρυσθέως κήρυκος ἀποσπᾶν θέλοντος τοὺς ἱκέτας ἐκώλυσεν αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ ἀπῆλθε πόλεμον ἀπειλήσας προσδέχεσθαι. Δημοφῶν δὲ τούτου μὲν ὠλιγώρει· χρησμῶν δὲ αὐτῶι νικηφόρων γενηθέντων, ἐὰν Δήμητρι τὴν εὐγενεστάτην παρθένον σφάξηι, τοῖς λογίοις βαρέως ἔσχεν· οὔτε (10) γὰρ ἰδίαν οὔτε τῶν πολιτῶν τινος θυγατέρα χάριν τῶν ἱκετῶν ἀποκτεῖναι δίκαιον ἡγεῖτο. τὴν μαντείαν δὲ προγνοῦσα μία τῶν Ἡρακλέους παίδων Μακαρία τὸν θάνατον ἑκουσίως ὑπέστη. ταύτην μὲν οὖν εὐγενῶς ἀποθανοῦσαν ἐτίμησαν, αὐτοὶ δὲ τοὺς πολεμίους ἐπιγνόντες παρόντας εἰς τὴν μάχην ὥρμησαν ... (15)

τὰ τοῦ δράματος πρόσωπα· Ἰόλαος, Κοπρεύς, χορός, Δημοφῶν, Μακαρία παρθένος, θεράπων, Ἀλκμήνη, ἄγγελος, Εὐρυσθεύς. προλογίζει δὲ ὁ Ἰόλαος.

Hypothesis to *Heraclidae*

Iolaus was the son of Iphicles and the nephew of Heracles. In his youth he joined Heracles on his campaigns and in his old age he was a concerned defender of his children. For when the children were being driven by Eurystheus from every country, he came to Athens with them, and having sought refuge with the gods there, he secured the protection of Demophon, ruler of the city. [5] When Kopreus, the herald of Eurystheus, intended to drag away the suppliants, Demophon prevented him, and Kopreus went away threatening imminent attack. Demophon treated this with contempt, but when the oracles predicted his victory if he sacrificed the noblest girl to Demeter, he was oppressed by their response. [10] For he did not think it right to kill either his own or the daughter of any of the citizens for the sake of the suppliants. But having learned of the prophecy, one of Heracles' children, Macaria, faced death willingly. So they honoured her noble death, and having discerned that the enemy were present, they themselves set out for battle ... [15]

The characters in the play: Iolaus, Kopreus, Chorus, Demophon, Macaria, Servant, Alcmene, Messenger, Eurystheus. Iolaus delivers the prologue.

ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΑΙ

ΙΟΛΑΟΣ

Πάλαι ποτ' ἐστὶ τοῦτ' ἐμοὶ δεδογμένον·
ὁ μὲν δίκαιος τοῖς πέλας πέφυκ' ἀνήρ,
ὃ δ' ἐς τὸ κέρδος λῆμ' ἔχων ἀνειμένον
πόλει τ' ἄχρηστος καὶ συναλλάσσειν βαρύς,
αὑτῷ δ' ἄριστος· οἶδα δ' οὐ λόγῳ μαθών.
ἐγὼ γὰρ αἰδοῖ καὶ τὸ συγγενὲς σέβων,
ἐξὸν κατ' Ἄργος ἡσύχως ναίειν, πόνων
πλείστων μετέσχον εἷς ἀνὴρ Ἡρακλέει,
ὅτ' ἦν μεθ' ἡμῶν· νῦν δ', ἐπεὶ κατ' οὐρανὸν
ναίει, τὰ κείνου τέκν' ἔχων ὑπὸ πτεροῖς
σῴζω τάδ' αὐτὸς δεόμενος σωτηρίας.
ἐπεὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν γῆς ἀπηλλάχθη πατήρ,
πρῶτον μὲν ἡμᾶς ἤθελ' Εὐρυσθεὺς κτανεῖν·
ἀλλ' ἐξέδραμεν, καὶ πόλις μὲν οἴχεται,
ψυχὴ δ' ἐσώθη. φεύγομεν δ' ἀλώμενοι
ἄλλην ἀπ' ἄλλης ἐξοριζόντων πόλιν.
πρὸς τοῖς γὰρ ἄλλοις καὶ τόδ' Εὐρυσθεὺς κακοῖς
ὕβρισμ' ἐς ἡμᾶς ἠξίωσεν ὑβρίσαι·
πέμπων ὅπου γῆς πυνθάνοιθ' ἱδρυμένους
κήρυκας ἐξαιτεῖ τε κἀξείργει χθονός,
πόλιν προτείνων Ἄργος οὐ σμικρὸν φίλην
ἐχθράν τε θέσθαι, χαὐτὸν εὐτυχοῦνθ' ἅμα.
οἳ δ' ἀσθενῆ μὲν τἀπ' ἐμοῦ δεδορκότες,
σμικροὺς δὲ τούσδε καὶ πατρὸς τητωμένους,
τοὺς κρείσσονας σέβοντες ἐξείργουσι γῆς.
ἐγὼ δὲ σὺν φεύγουσι συμφεύγω τέκνοις
καὶ σὺν κακῶς πράσσουσι συμπράσσω κακῶς,
ὀκνῶν προδοῦναι, μή τις ὧδ' εἴπῃ βροτῶν·
Ἴδεσθ', ἐπειδὴ παισὶν οὐκ ἔστιν πατήρ,
Ἰόλαος οὐκ ἤμυνε συγγενὴς γεγώς.
πάσης δὲ χώρας Ἑλλάδος τητώμενοι

---

16 ἐξοριζόντων Diggle: ἐξορίζοντες L

THE CHILDREN OF HERACLES

The skene-building represents the temple of Zeus Agoraios at Marathon, in front of which stands an altar. Eisodos A (left) leads to Argos and Eurystheus' camp, Eisodos B (right) to Marathon. Iolaus and the young sons of Heracles are seated as suppliants on the altar steps.

IOLAUS: Long ago now I came to this conclusion: one man is just to his neighbours, but another whose spirit is given up to gain is useless to his city and hard to have dealings with, being best to himself. I know this from experience, not on hearsay. [5] For out of honour and because I respected our kinship, though I could have lived quietly in Argos, I was the man who shared in Heracles' many labours while he was with us. And now, since he dwells in heaven, I have taken these children of his beneath my wing [10] and protect them, though I myself am in need of salvation.

When their father departed from the earth, Eurystheus first decided to kill us. But we ran away, and though our city was lost, our lives were saved. We wander in exile [15] from city to city as people drive us beyond their borders. For in addition to his other evil acts Eurystheus thought it fitting to inflict this outrage upon us too: sending heralds to wherever on earth he learned we were settled, he demanded our surrender and shut us out from the land, [20] claiming that it was no small matter to set Argos on a friendly or a hostile footing, and that he enjoyed good fortune too. When they see that my powers are weak and that these children are small and bereft of their father, they pay heed to the stronger and shut us out from their land. [25] I join the exiled children in exile and share the misfortune of the unfortunate, ashamed of betraying them lest someone should say, 'Look, since the children have no father, Iolaus has not protected them, though he is their kinsman!' [30]

Deprived of every part of Greece, we have come to Marathon

Μαραθῶνα καὶ σύγκληρον ἐλθόντες χθόνα
ἱκέται καθεζόμεσθα βώμιοι θεῶν
προσωφελῆσαι· πεδία γὰρ τῆσδε χθονὸς
δισσοὺς κατοικεῖν Θησέως παῖδας λόγος
κλήρῳ λαχόντας ἐκ γένους Πανδίονος,
τοῖσδ' ἐγγὺς ὄντας· ὧν ἕκατι τέρμονας
κλεινῶν Ἀθηνῶν τήνδ' ἀφικόμεσθ' ὁδόν.
δυοῖν γερόντοιν δὲ στρατηγεῖται φυγή·
ἐγὼ μὲν ἀμφὶ τοῖσδε καλχαίνων τέκνοις,
ἥ δ' αὖ τὸ θῆλυ παιδὸς Ἀλκμήνη γένος
ἔσωθε ναοῦ τοῦδ' ὑπηγκαλισμένη
σῴζει· νέας γὰρ παρθένους αἰδούμεθα
ὄχλῳ πελάζειν κἀπιβωμιοστατεῖν.
Ὕλλος δ' ἀδελφοί θ' οἵσι πρεσβεύει γένος
ζητοῦσ' ὅπου γῆς πύργον οἰκιούμεθα,
ἣν τῆσδ' ἀπωθώμεσθα πρὸς βίαν χθονός.
ὦ τέκνα τέκνα, δεῦρο, λαμβάνεσθ' ἐμῶν
πέπλων· ὁρῶ κήρυκα τόνδ' Εὐρυσθέως
στείχοντ' ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, οὗ διωκόμεσθ' ὕπο
πάσης ἀλῆται γῆς ἀπεστερημένοι.
ὦ μῖσος, εἴθ' ὅλοιο χὠ πέμψας ‹σ'› ἀνήρ,
ὡς πολλὰ δὴ καὶ τῶνδε γενναίῳ πατρὶ
ἐκ τοῦδε ταὐτοῦ στόματος ἤγγειλας κακά.

ΚΗΡΥΞ

ἦ που καθῆσθαι τήνδ' ἔδραν καλὴν δοκεῖς
πόλιν τ' ἀφῖχθαι σύμμαχον, κακῶς φρονῶν·
οὐ γάρ τις ἔστιν ὃς πάροιθ' αἱρήσεται
τὴν σὴν ἀχρεῖον δύναμιν ἀντ' Εὐρυσθέως.
χώρει· τί μοχθεῖς ταῦτ'; ἀνίστασθαί σε χρὴ
ἐς Ἄργος, οὗ σε λεύσιμος μένει δίκη.
Ιο. οὐ δῆτ', ἐπεί μοι βωμὸς ἀρκέσει θεοῦ,
ἐλευθέρα τε γαῖ' ἐν ᾗ βεβήκαμεν.
Κη. βούλῃ πόνον μοι τῆδε προσθεῖναι χερί;
Ιο. οὔτοι βίᾳ γέ μ' οὐδὲ τούσδ' ἄξεις λαβών.

---

38 τήνδ' ... ὁδόν Stephanus: τόνδ' ... ὅρον L
40 καλχαίνων Triclinius: χαλκ- L
52 <σ'> Barnes
55 Κῆρυξ Hartung: κοπρεύς L (throughout)

and its neighbouring land and sit at the altar supplicating the gods for help. For it is said that the two sons of Theseus govern the plains of this land, [35] having received it when lots were cast among the descendants of Pandion, and they are related to these children. We have therefore come on this journey to the land of glorious Athens. Our flight is led by two old people: I am darkly troubled about these boys, [40] while Alcmene, having the daughters of her son clasped in her arms within this temple, keeps them safe. For we feel shame at young girls coming into public view and standing suppliant at the altar. Hyllus and his eldest brothers [45] are searching for some place where we can establish a stronghold if we are forcibly repelled from this land.

The Herald of Eurystheus enters by Eisodos A.

O children, children, over here, take hold of my clothes! I see the herald of Eurystheus advancing here upon us, the man by whom we are pursued [50] and made wanderers deprived of every land. You hateful creature, may death take you, along with the man who sent you, since that mouth of yours announced many evil things for these children's noble father too!

HERALD: You no doubt believe that you have taken up a fine seat here [55] and have reached a city that is your ally – what foolish thinking! For there is no one who will choose your useless strength in preference to Eurystheus. Get moving! Why make all this effort? You must get up and go to Argos, where the penalty of stoning awaits you. [60]

IOLAUS: No! For the god's altar shall protect me, and the land we have come to is free.

HERALD: Do you want to make more trouble for this hand of mine?

IOLAUS: You will not take me and these children away by violence!

Κη. γνώσῃ σύ· μάντις δ' ἦσθ' ἄρ' οὐ καλὸς τάδε.
Ιο. οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτ' ἐμοῦ ζῶντός ποτε.
Κη. ἄπερρ'· ἐγὼ δὲ τούσδε, κἂν σὺ μὴ θέλῃς,
ἄξω νομίζων οὕπερ εἰσ' Εὐρυσθέως.
Ιο. ὦ τὰς Ἀθήνας δαρὸν οἰκοῦντες χρόνον,
ἀμύνεθ'· ἱκέται δ' ὄντες ἀγοραίου Διὸς
βιαζόμεσθα καὶ στέφη μιαίνεται,
πόλει τ' ὄνειδος καὶ θεῶν ἀτιμίαν.

ΧΟΡΟΣ

ἔα ἔα· τίς ἡ βοὴ βωμοῦ πέλας
ἔστηκε; ποίαν συμφορὰν δείξει τάχα;

ἴδετε τὸν γέροντ' ἀμαλὸν ἐπὶ πέδῳ [στρ.
χύμενον· ὦ τάλας
‹ ›
πρὸς τοῦ ποτ' ἐν γῇ πτῶμα δύστηνον πίτνεις;
Ιο. ὅδ' ὦ ξένοι με σοὺς ἀτιμάζων θεοὺς
ἔλκει βιαίως Ζηνὸς ἐκ προβωμίων.
Χο. σὺ δ' ἐκ τίνος γῆς, ὦ γέρον, τετράπτολιν
ξύνοικον ἦλθες λαόν; ἢ
πέραθεν ἁλίῳ πλάτᾳ
κατέχετ' ἐκλιπόντες Εὐβοῖδ' ἀκτάν;
Ιο. οὐ νησιώτην, ὦ ξένοι, τρίβω βίον,
ἀλλ' ἐκ Μυκηνῶν σὴν ἀφίγμεθα χθόνα.
Χο. ὄνομα τί σε, γέρον, Μυκηναῖος ὠ-
νόμαζεν λεώς;
Ιο. τὸν Ἡράκλειον ἴστε που παραστάτην
Ἰόλαον· οὐ γὰρ σῶμ' ἀκήρυκτον τόδε.
Χο. οἶδ' εἰσακούσας καὶ πρίν· ἀλλὰ τοῦ ποτε
ἐν χειρὶ σᾷ κομίζεις κόρους
νεοτρεφεῖς; φράσον.
Ιο. Ἡρακλέους οἵδ' εἰσὶ παῖδες, ὦ ξένοι,
ἱκέται σέθεν τε καὶ πόλεως ἀφιγμένοι.

---

67 ἄπερρ' Cobet: ἄπαιρ' L
72 ἀτιμίαν England: ἵα L
75 γέροντ' ἀμαλὸν Wesseling: γέροντα μᾶλλον L
77 lacuna before this verse indicated by Murray

HERALD: You'll see! [*He seizes the children.*] You are not, it seems, a perfect prophet in these matters. [65]

IOLAUS: This will never happen as long as I live!

HERALD: Get out of here! [*He knocks Iolaus to the ground.*] I shall drag these children away, even if you're unwilling, considering them Eurystheus' property, which they are.

IOLAUS: You who dwell in Athens from olden times, protect us! We, suppliants of Zeus Agoraios, [70] are being handled with violence and our suppliant branches defiled, a disgrace to your city and a dishonour to the gods!

The Chorus, old men of Marathon, enter hurriedly by Eisodos B.

CHORUS: Ah! Ah! What is the shouting that has arisen beside the altar? What misfortune will it soon reveal?

[Strophe:] *See the weak old man sprawled helplessly on the ground!* [75] *My poor man,*

< >

who in the world caused you to fall so wretchedly on the ground?

IOLAUS: *This man, strangers, dishonours your gods and drags me violently from Zeus' altar steps.*

CHORUS: *From what land, old man, have you come to the people who live in the four towns?* [80] *Or did you put in from across the water with seafaring oar, leaving the shore of Euboea?*

IOLAUS: *It is no islander's life I lead, strangers, but we have come to your land from Mycenae.* [85]

CHORUS: *By what name did the people of Mycenae call you, old man?*

IOLAUS: *You no doubt know of Heracles' comrade, Iolaus. For mine is a name not without fame in heralds' proclamations.*

CHORUS: *Yes, I have heard of you before. But whose* [90] *young boys do you have in your care? Tell us.*

IOLAUS: *These are the sons of Heracles, strangers, who have come to supplicate you and your city.*

Χο. τί χρέος; ἢ λόγων πόλεος, ἔνεπέ μοι, [ἀντ.
μελόμενοι τυχεῖν;
Ιο. μήτ' ἐκδοθῆναι μήτε πρὸς βίαν θεῶν
τῶν σῶν ἀποσπασθέντες εἰς Ἄργος μολεῖν.
Κη. ἀλλ' οὔτι τοῖς σοῖς δεσπόταις τάδ' ἀρκέσει,
οἳ σοῦ κρατοῦντες ἐνθάδ' εὑρίσκουσί σε.
Χο. εἰκὸς θεῶν ἱκτῆρας αἰδεῖσθαι, ξένε,
καὶ μὴ βιαίῳ χειρὶ δαι-
μόνων ἀπολιπεῖν σφ' ἕδη·
πότνια γὰρ Δίκα τάδ' οὐ πείσεται.
Κη. ἔκπεμπέ νυν γῆς τούσδε τοὺς Εὐρυσθέως,
κοὐδὲν βιαίῳ τῇδε χρήσομαι χερί.
Χο. ἄθεον ἱκεσίαν μεθεῖναι πόλει
ξένων προστροπάν.
Κη. καλὸν δέ γ' ἔξω πραγμάτων ἔχειν πόδα,
εὐβουλίας τυχόντα τῆς ἀμείνονος.
‹Χο. ›
‹ ›
‹ ›
‹Κη. ›
‹ ›

Χο. οὐκοῦν τυράννῳ τῆσδε γῆς φράσαντά σε
χρῆν ταῦτα τολμᾶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ βίᾳ ξένους
θεῶν ἀφέλκειν, γῆν σέβοντ' ἐλευθέραν;
Κη. τίς δ' ἐστὶ χώρας τῆσδε καὶ πόλεως ἄναξ;
Χο. ἐσθλοῦ πατρὸς παῖς Δημοφῶν ὁ Θησέως.
Κη. πρὸς τοῦτον ἀγὼν ἆρα τοῦδε τοῦ λόγου
μάλιστ' ἂν εἴη· τἄλλα δ' εἴρηται μάτην.
Χο. καὶ μὴν ὅδ' αὐτὸς ἔρχεται σπουδὴν ἔχων
Ἀκάμας τ' ἀδελφός, τῶνδ' ἐπήκοοι λόγων.

ΔΗΜΟΦΩΝ
ἐπείπερ ἔφθης πρέσβυς ὢν νεωτέρους
βοηδρομήσας τήνδ' ἐπ' ἐσχάραν Διός,
λέξον, τίς ὄχλον τόνδ' ἀθροίζεται τύχη;

---

110 lacuna of five verses indicated by Kirchhoff

CHORUS [Antistrophe]: *For what? Tell me, do you want to talk with the city?* [95]

IOLAUS: *We ask not to be handed over or dragged by force from your gods and taken to Argos.*

HERALD: *But this will not please your masters, who, though they rule you, find you here.* [100]

CHORUS: *It is right to respect the gods' suppliants, stranger, and they should not leave the gods' shrines by force. For sovereign Justice will not allow such treatment.*

HERALD: *Then send these children, who belong to Eurystheus, out of your land,* [105] *and I shall use no force here.*

CHORUS: *It is impious for a city to give up a suppliant band of strangers.*

HERALD: *Yes, but it is a good thing to keep out of trouble by accepting better advice.* [110]

<CHORUS: >
< >
< >
<HERALD: >
< >

CHORUS-LEADER: Should you not have spoken to the ruler of this land before daring this, and not drag strangers from the gods by force, showing respect for the land's independence?

HERALD: Who is king of this land and city?

CHORUS: Demophon, son of a noble father, Theseus. [115]

HERALD: Then the argument over this case should rather be before him. The rest has been a waste of words.

CHORUS: But here he comes quickly himself, and his brother Acamas, to hear these speeches.

Demophon and Acamas enter with their attendants by Eisodos B.

DEMOPHON [*Addressing the Chorus-leader*]: Since you, old though you are, were quicker than younger men [120] in running to a cry for aid at this altar of Zeus, tell me, what event makes this crowd gather?

Χο. ἱκέται κάθηνται παῖδες οἵδ' Ἡρακλέους
βωμὸν καταστέψαντες, ὡς ὁρᾷς, ἄναξ,
πατρός τε πιστὸς Ἰόλεως παραστάτης.
Δη. τί δῆτ' ἰυγμῶν ἥδ' ἐδεῖτο συμφορά;
Χο. βίᾳ νιν οὗτος τῆσδ' ἀπ' ἐσχάρας ἄγειν
ζητῶν βοὴν ἔστησε κἄσφηλεν γόνυ
γέροντος, ὥστε μ' ἐκβαλεῖν οἴκτῳ δάκρυ.
Δη. καὶ μὴν στολήν γ' Ἕλληνα καὶ ῥυθμὸν πέπλων
ἔχει, τὰ δ' ἔργα βαρβάρου χερὸς τάδε.
σὸν δὴ τὸ φράζειν ἐστί, μὴ μέλλειν ‹δ'›, ἐμοὶ
ποίας ἀφῖξαι δεῦρο γῆς ὅρους λιπών.
Κη. Ἀργεῖός εἰμι· τοῦτο γὰρ θέλεις μαθεῖν·
ἐφ' οἷσι δ' ἥκω καὶ παρ' οὗ λέγειν θέλω.
πέμπει Μυκηνῶν δεῦρό μ' Εὐρυσθεὺς ἄναξ
ἄξοντα τούσδε· πολλὰ δ' ἦλθον, ὦ ξένε,
δίκαι' ἁμαρτῇ δρᾶν τε καὶ λέγειν ἔχων.
Ἀργεῖος ὢν γὰρ αὐτὸς Ἀργείους ἄγω
ἐκ τῆς ἐμαυτοῦ τούσδε δραπέτας ἔχων,
νόμοισι τοῖς ἐκεῖθεν ἐψηφισμένους
θανεῖν· δίκαιοι δ' ἐσμὲν οἰκοῦντες πόλιν
αὐτοὶ καθ' αὑτῶν κυρίους κραίνειν δίκας.
πολλῶν δὲ κἄλλων ἑστίας ἀφιγμένοι
ἐν τοῖσιν αὐτοῖς τοισίδ' ἕσταμεν λόγοις,
κοὐδεὶς ἐτόλμησ' ἴδια προσθέσθαι κακά.
ἀλλ' ἤ τιν' ἐς σὲ μωρίαν ἐσκεμμένοι
δεῦρ' ἦλθον ἢ κίνδυνον ἐξ ἀμηχάνων
ῥίπτοντες, εἴτ' οὖν εἴτε μὴ γενήσεται
‹ ›.
οὐ γὰρ φρενήρη γ' ὄντα σ' ἐλπίζουσί που
μόνον τοσαύτης ἦν ἐπῆλθον Ἑλλάδος
τὰς τῶνδ' ἀβούλως συμφορὰς κατοικτιεῖν.
φέρ' ἀντίθες γάρ· τούσδε τ' ἐς γαῖαν παρεὶς
ἡμᾶς τ' ἐάσας ἐξάγειν, τί κερδανεῖς;
τὰ μὲν παρ' ἡμῶν τοιάδ' ἔστι σοι λαβεῖν·
Ἄργους τοσήνδε χεῖρα τήν τ' Εὐρυσθέως

---

132 ‹δ'› Reisig
140 ἔχων] χθονός Kirchhoff
149 lacuna indicated by Diggle: ‹τὰ σ' ὧδ' ἀσύνετα καὶ φρενῶν τητώμενα›

CHORUS-LEARER: These are the sons of Heracles sitting as suppliants, having wreathed the altar, as you see, my king, and with them is their father's loyal comrade, Iolaus. [125]

DEMOPHON: But why did this situation require cries of pain?

CHORUS-LEADER: This man, seeking to drag them forcibly from the altar here, made them raise a cry and knocked the old man to the ground so that I shed tears of pity.

DEMOPHON: His clothes and the arrangement of his garments are certainly Greek, [130] yet these actions of his are barbaric. [*To the Herald.*] It is your job to tell me, and do not delay, what land you left to come here.

HERALD: I am from Argos, since that is what you want to know; now I want to say for what purpose I have come and from whom. [135] Eurystheus, king of Mycenae, sent me here to take these children back. And I have come, sir, with many just claims both to enforce and to plead at the same time. An Argive myself, I seek to lead back Argives, these runaways from my country, [140] who have been condemned to death by the laws there. We who inhabit that city have the right to execute effective judgements against ourselves. Having come to the hearths of many other people, we have taken our stand on these very same arguments, [145] and no one has dared to bring trouble upon themselves. But it is either because they have seen some stupidity that they have come here to you, or because out of desperation they are risking danger to see whether or not there will be <on your side such unsoundness of mind>. For they surely do not expect that, in your right senses, [150] you alone of all the Greeks they have approached would be ill-advised enough to pity their misfortunes.

Come, compare the two sides: what will you gain by admitting these people into your country or by allowing us to take them away? These are the things you can get from us: [155] to add such a mighty Argive army and the whole strength of Eurystheus to this city.

ἰσχὺν ἅπασαν τῇδε προσθέσθαι πόλει.
ἢν δ' ἐς λόγους τε καὶ τὰ τῶνδ' οἰκτίσματα
βλέψας πεπανθῇς, ἐς πάλην καθίσταται
δορὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα· μὴ γὰρ ὡς μεθήσομεν
δόξῃς ἀγῶνος τούσδ' ἄτερ χαλυβδικοῦ.
τί δῆτα φήσεις, ποῖα πεδί' ἀφαιρεθείς,
τί ῥυσιασθείς, πόλεμον Ἀργείοις ἔχειν;
ποίοις δ' ἀμύνων συμμάχοις, τίνος δ' ὕπερ
θάψεις νεκροὺς πεσόντας; ἢ κακὸν λόγον
κτήσῃ πρὸς ἀστῶν, εἰ γέροντος οὕνεκα
τύμβου, τὸ μηδὲν ὄντος, ὡς εἰπεῖν ἔπος,
παίδων ‹τε› τῶνδ' ἐς ἄντλον ἐμβήσῃ πόδα.
†ἐρεῖς τὸ λῷστον ἐλπίδ' εὑρήσειν μόνον†·
καὶ τοῦτο πολλῷ τοῦ παρόντος ἐνδεές.
κακῶς γὰρ Ἀργείοισιν οἴδ' ὡπλισμένοις
μάχοιντ' ἂν ἡβήσαντες, εἴ ‹τι› τοῦτό σε
ψυχὴν ἐπαίρει· χοὐν μέσῳ πολὺς χρόνος
ἐν ᾧ διεργασθεῖτ' ἄν. ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ·
δοὺς μηδὲν ἀλλὰ τἄμ' ἐῶν ἄγειν ἐμὲ
κτῆσαι Μυκήνας, μηδ' ὅπερ φιλεῖτε δρᾶν
πάθῃς σὺ τοῦτο, τοὺς ἀμείνονας παρὸν
φίλους ἑλέσθαι τοὺς κακίονας λαβεῖν.
Χο. τίς ἂν δίκην κρίνειεν ἢ γνοίη λόγον,
πρὶν ἄν παρ' ἀμφοῖν μῦθον ἐκμάθῃ σαφῶς;
Ιο. ἄναξ, ὑπάρχει γὰρ τόδ' ἐν τῇ σῇ χθονί,
εἰπεῖν ἀκοῦσαί τ' ἐν μέρει πάρεστί μοι,
κοὐδείς μ' ἀπώσει πρόσθεν ὥσπερ ἄλλοθεν.
ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ τῷδ' οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐν μέσωι·
ἐπεὶ γὰρ Ἄργους οὐ μέτεσθ' ἡμῖν ἔτι,
ψήφῳ. δοκῆσαν, ἀλλὰ φεύγομεν πάτραν,
πῶς ἂν δικαίως ὡς Μυκηναίους ἄγοι

---

163 τί ῥυσιασθείς Kirchhoff: τιρυνθίοις θῆς L
168 <τε> Triclinius
169 ἔξεις Diggle, lacuna indicated by Musso
172 <τι> Elmsley
178 λαβεῖν Kirchhoff: λάβῃς L
179 Χο. Elmsley: δη. L
184 μέσωι Valckenaer: μέρει L
185 οὐ μέτεσθ' Dobree: οὐδέν ἔσθ' L

However, if you grow soft through paying attention to their words and lamentations, the matter will have to be settled with the spear. For do not think that we will give these children up [160] without a contest of steel. What will you say then, what territory have you been deprived of, what robbed from you, to justify war with Argos? Defending which allies, and on whose behalf will you bury the dead that have fallen? You will certainly get abuse [165] from your citizens if you get into difficult waters for the sake of an ancient man, almost a tomb, a nothing, and these children! You will have at best only the hope of soon having the children as allies, but this too is far inferior to the present offer. [170] For against fully-armed Argives these boys, once grown to adulthood, would be inferior fighters (if this is what lifts your spirits), and in the interval there is a long time in which you could be destroyed. But listen to me: by giving nothing yourself but allowing me to remove what is mine, [175] gain Mycenae as your ally, and do not, as you like to do, make this mistake, taking the worse people as your friends when it is possible to choose the better.

CHORUS-LEADER: Who could judge a case or decide an argument until he has learned clearly what both sides have to say? [180]

IOLAUS [*Rising to his feet*]: My lord, since this is allowed in your land, I can speak and listen in turn, and no one will push me away without being heard, as they have elsewhere. Between us and this man there is nothing in common. Since we no longer have a share in Argos, [185] as was decided by vote, but are fugitives from our native land, how could this man justly lead us off as Mycenaeans, when they have

ὁδ' ὄντας ἡμᾶς, οὓς ἀπήλασαν χθονός;
ξένοι γάρ ἐσμεν. ἢ τὸν Ἑλλήνων ὅρον
φεύγειν δικαιοῦθ' ὅστις ἂν τἄργος φύγῃ;
οὔκουν Ἀθήνας γ'· οὐ γὰρ Ἀργείων φόβῳ
τοὺς Ἡρακλείους παῖδας ἐξελῶσι γῆς.
οὐ γάρ τι Τραχίς ἐστιν οὐδ' Ἀχαικὸν
πόλισμ' ὅθεν σὺ τούσδε, τῇ δίκῃ μὲν οὔ,
τὸ δ' Ἄργος ὀγκῶν, οἷάπερ καὶ νῦν λέγεις,
ἤλαυνες ἱκέτας βωμίους καθημένους.
εἰ γὰρ τόδ' ἔσται καὶ λόγους κρινοῦσι σούς,
οὐκ οἶδ' Ἀθήνας τάσδ' ἐλευθέρας ἔτι.
ἀλλ' οἶδ' ἐγὼ τὸ τῶνδε λῆμα καὶ φύσιν·
θνῄσκειν θελήσουσ'· ἡ γὰρ αἰσχύνη ‹πάρος›
τοῦ ζῆν παρ' ἐσθλοῖς ἀνδράσιν νομίζεται.
πόλει μὲν ἀρκεῖ· καὶ γὰρ οὖν ἐπίφθονον
λίαν ἐπαινεῖν ἐστι, πολλάκις δὲ δὴ
καὐτὸς βαρυνθεὶς οἶδ' ἄγαν αἰνούμενος.
σοὶ δ' ὡς ἀνάγκη τούσδε βούλομαι φράσαι
σῴζειν, ἐπείπερ τῆσδε προστατεῖς χθονός.
Πιτθεὺς μέν ἐστι Πέλοπος, ἐκ δὲ Πιτθέως
Αἴθρα, πατὴρ δ' ἐκ τῆσδε γενναῖται σέθεν
Θησεύς. πάλιν δὲ τῶνδ' ἄνειμί σοι γένος·
Ἡρακλέης ἦν Ζηνὸς Ἀλκμήνης τε παῖς,
κείνη δὲ Πέλοπος θυγατρός· αὐτανεψίων
πατὴρ ἂν εἴη σός τε χὠ τούτων γεγώς.
γένους μὲν ἥκεις ὧδε τοῖσδε, Δημοφῶν·
ἃ δ' ἐκτὸς ἤδη τοῦ προσήκοντός σε δεῖ
τεῖσαι λέγω σοι παισί. φημὶ γάρ ποτε
σύμπλους γενέσθαι τῶνδ' ὑπασπίζων πατρὶ
ζωστῆρα Θησεῖ τὸν πολυκτόνον μέτα
‹ ›
‹ ›
Ἄιδου τ' ἐρεμνῶν ἐξανήγαγεν μυχῶν
πατέρα σόν· Ἑλλὰς πᾶσα τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ.
ὧν ἀντιδοῦναί σ' οἵδ' ἀπαιτοῦσιν χάριν,

198 οὔ φημ' Kirchhoff
200 <πάρος> Reiske
217 lacuna indicated by Dobree

driven us out of the country? For we are foreigners. [*Turning to the Herald*] Or do you claim that whoever is a fugitive from Argos should be a fugitive from the whole of Greece? [190] Well certainly not from Athens! They will not drive the children of Heracles from their land for fear of Argives! For this is not Trachis or some Achaean town from where, with no regard for justice, but extolling Argos with such words as you speak right now, [195] you sought to drive these children away as they were seated as suppliants at the altar. If this happens and they decide in favour of your arguments, I do not recognize Athens here as any longer free. But I know the spirit and the character of these people: they will be willing to die. For a sense of honour [200] counts for more than life in the judgement of noble men.

That is enough as far as the city is concerned: for in fact to praise too much is invidious, and I know that I myself have been oppressed many times by being overpraised. [*Turning to Demophon*] But to you I want to say that, [205] since you govern this land, you must save these children. Pittheus was the son of Pelops, and from Pittheus came Aethra, and from her was born your father, Theseus. Next I shall trace back for you the ancestry of these children. Heracles was the son of Zeus and Alcmene, [210] and she was born to Pelops' daughter. Your father and theirs are thus the children of first cousins. This is how you are related to them by descent, Demophon. But let me tell you what you must render the children apart from this kinship of yours. For I declare [215] that as shield-bearer to their father I once sailed with Theseus to fetch the girdle that caused so many deaths

< >

< >

and he brought your father back up from the dark recesses of Hades. All Greece bears witness to this. These children request that you grant a favour in return for these things [220], and they not be handed over

μήτ' ἐκδοθῆναι μήτε πρὸς βίαν θεῶν
τῶν σῶν ἀποσπασθέντες ἐκπεσεῖν χθονός.
σοὶ γὰρ τόδ' αἰσχρὸν χωρὶς ἐν πόλει τ' ἴσον,
ἱκέτας ἀλήτας συγγενεῖς - οἴμοι, κακῶν·
βλέψον πρὸς αὐτούς, βλέψον - ἕλκεσθαι βίᾳ.
ἀλλ' ἄντομαί σε καὶ καταστέφων χεροῖν
καὶ πρὸς γενείου, μηδαμῶς ἀτιμάσῃς
τοὺς Ἡρακλείους παῖδας ἐς χέρας λαβεῖν·
γενοῦ δὲ τοῖσδε συγγενής, γενοῦ φίλος
πατὴρ ἀδελφὸς δεσπότης· ἅπαντα γὰρ
τἄλλ' ἐστὶ κρείσσω πλὴν ὑπ' Ἀργείοις πεσεῖν.
Χο. ὦκτιρ' ἀκούσας τούσδε συμφορᾶς, ἄναξ.
τὴν δ' εὐγένειαν τῆς τύχης νικωμένην
νῦν δὴ μάλιστ' ἐσεῖδον· οἵδε γὰρ πατρὸς
ἐσθλοῦ γεγῶτες δυστυχοῦσ' ἀναξίως.
Δη. τρισσαί μ' ἀναγκάζουσι συννοίας ὁδοί,
Ἰόλαε, τοὺς σοὺς μὴ παρώσασθαι λόγους·
τὸ μὲν μέγιστον Ζεὺς ἐφ' οὗ σὺ βώμιος
θακεῖς νεοσσῶν τήνδ' ἔχων πανήγυριν,
τὸ συγγενές τε καὶ τὸ προυφείλειν καλῶς
πράσσειν παρ' ἡμῶν τούσδε πατρῴαν χάριν,
τό τ' αἰσχρόν, οὗπερ δεῖ μάλιστα φροντίσαι·
εἰ γὰρ παρήσω τόνδε συλᾶσθαι βίᾳ
ξένου πρὸς ἀνδρὸς βωμόν, οὐκ ἐλευθέραν
οἰκεῖν δοκήσω γαῖαν, Ἀργείων δ' ὄκνῳ
ἱκέτας προδοῦναι· καὶ τάδ' ἀγχόνης πέλας.
ἀλλ' ὤφελες μὲν εὐτυχέστερος μολεῖν,
ὅμως δὲ καὶ νῦν μὴ τρέσῃς ὅπως σέ τις
σὺν παισὶ βωμοῦ τοῦδ' ἀποσπάσει βίᾳ.
σὺ δ' Ἄργος ἐλθὼν ταῦτά τ' Εὐρυσθεῖ φράσον
πρὸς τοῖσδέ τ', εἴ τι τοισίδ' ἐγκαλεῖ ξένοις,
δίκης κυρήσειν· τούσδε δ' οὐκ ἄξεις ποτέ.
Κη. οὐκ ἦν δίκαιον ἦ τι καὶ νικῶ λόγῳ;
Δη. καὶ πῶς δίκαιον τὸν ἱκέτην ἄγειν βίᾳ;

---

223 ἐν πόλει τ' ἴσον Jackson: ἔν τε πόλει κακόν L
226 καταστέφων Diggle: -στέφω L
231 τἄλλ' Häberlin: ταὔτ' L
236 συννοίας F. W. Schmidt: συμφορᾶς L

or dragged in violence to your gods and expelled from the land. For this is a disgrace to you personally and equally in regard to the city, if suppliants, exiles, kinsmen – such sufferings! look at them, look! – are dragged away by force. [225]

[*Kneels as a suppliant*] But I beg you, both garlanding your knees with my hands, and by your chin, do not refuse to take the children of Heracles into your protection! Become kinsman to these children, become friend, father, brother, master: for everything [230] else is better than to fall victim to the Argives!

CHORUS-LEADER: As I listen I pity these children for their suffering, my lord. Nobility utterly defeated by circumstance is what I see right now. For these children, born of a noble father, are suffering misfortune undeservedly. [235]

DEMOPHON: [*Helping Iolaus to his feet*] Three kinds of conscience compel me, Iolaus, not to reject your arguments. The greatest is Zeus, at whose altar you sit with this gathering of fledglings; then the tie of kinship and the prior obligation [240] that these ones be well treated by us for the sake of their father. And finally dishonour, of which I must be particularly mindful. For if I allow this altar to be violently pillaged by a foreigner, I shall not be thought to govern a free country, but to have abandoned suppliants for fear of Argives, [245] and that is almost worth hanging myself! Though I wish you had come in a more fortunate state, still even now do not be afraid that anyone will tear you and the children from this altar by force.

[*To the Herald*] You there, go to Argos and tell this to Eurystheus, [250] and say in addition that if he lodges any charge against these foreigners, he will meet with justice. But you will never drag these children away.

HERALD: Not even if it is a just claim and I win with my plea?

DEMOPHON: How is it just to take a suppliant away by force?

Κη. οὔκουν ἐμοὶ τόδ' αἰσχρόν ἀλλ' οὐ σοὶ βλάβος;
Δη. ἐμοί γ', ἐάν σοι τούσδ' ἐφέλκεσθαι μεθῶ.
Κη. σὺ δ' ἐξόριζε κᾆτ' ἐκεῖθεν ἄξομεν.
Δη. σκαιὸς πέφυκας τοῦ θεοῦ πλείω φρονῶν.
Κη. δεῦρ', ὡς ἔοικε, τοῖς κακοῖσι φευκτέον.
Δη. ἅπασι κοινὸν ῥῦμα δαιμόνων ἕδρα.
Κη. ταῦτ' οὐ δοκήσει τοῖς Μυκηναίοις ἴσως.
Δη. οὔκουν ἐγὼ τῶν ἐνθάδ' εἰμὶ κύριος;
Κη. βλάπτων ‹γ'› ἐκείνους μηδέν, ἢν σὺ σωφρονῇς.
Δη. βλάπτεσθ', ἐμοῦ γε μὴ μιαίνοντος θεούς.
Κη. οὐ βούλομαί σε πόλεμον Ἀργείοις ἔχειν.
Δη. κἀγὼ τοιοῦτος· τῶνδε δ' οὐ μεθήσομαι.
Κη. ἄξω γε μέντοι τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἐγὼ λαβών.
Δη. οὐκ ἆρ' ἐς Ἄργος ῥᾳδίως ἄπει πάλιν.
Κη. πειρώμενος δὴ τοῦτό γ' αὐτίκ' εἴσομαι.
Δη. κλαίων ἄρ' ἄψῃ τῶνδε κοὐκ ἐς ἀμβολάς.
Χο. μὴ πρὸς θεῶν κήρυκα τολμήσῃς θενεῖν.
Δη. εἰ μή γ' ὁ κῆρυξ σωφρονεῖν μαθήσεται.
Χο. ἄπελθε· καὶ σὺ τοῦδε μὴ θίγῃς, ἄναξ.
Κη. στείχω· μιᾶς γὰρ χειρὸς ἀσθενὴς μάχη.
ἥξω δὲ πολλὴν Ἄρεος Ἀργείου λαβὼν
πάγχαλκον αἰχμὴν δεῦρο. μυρίοι δέ με
μένουσιν ἀσπιστῆρες Εὐρυσθεύς τ' ἄναξ
αὐτὸς στρατηγῶν· Ἀλκάθου δ' ἐπ' ἐσχάτοις
καραδοκῶν τἀνθένδε τέρμασιν μένει.
λαμπρὸς δ' ἀκούσας σὴν ὕβριν φανήσεται
σοὶ καὶ πολίταις γῇ τε τῇδε καὶ φυτοῖς·
μάτην γὰρ ἦβην ὧδέ γ' ἂν κεκτήμεθα
πολλὴν ἐν Ἄργει, μή σε τιμωρούμενοι.
Δη. φθείρου· τὸ σὸν γὰρ Ἄργος οὐ δέδοικ' ἐγώ.
ἐνθένδε δ' οὐκ ἔμελλες αἰσχύνας ἐμὲ
ἄξειν βίᾳ τούσδ'· οὐ γὰρ Ἀργείων πόλιν
ὑπήκοον τήνδ' ἀλλ' ἐλευθέραν ἔχω.

Χο. ὥρα προνοεῖν, πρὶν ὅροις πελάσαι
στρατὸν Ἀργείων·

---

263 ‹γ'› Elmsley
286 πόλιν Elmsley: πόλει L

HERALD: Isn't this dishonourable for me, but of no harm to you? [255]

DEMOPHON: It *does* harm me if I release these children for you to drag away.

HERALD: Then send them beyond the frontier and we will take them from there.

DEMOPHON: You are a fool to think your ideas above god.

HERALD: Here, it seems, is where the wicked should should seek refuge.

DEMOPHON: A sanctuary of the gods is a common defence for all. [260]

HERALD: Perhaps it will not appear so to the Mycenaeans.

DEMOPHON: So do I not have authority over matters here?

HERALD: Yes, provided you do the Argives no harm, if you are sensible.

DEMOPHON: Then be harmed yourselves! I at any rate shall not defile the gods.

HERALD: I do not want you to have a war with the Argives. [265]

DEMOPHON: And I am of the same mind. But I will not release these children.

HERALD: I will lead them away nonetheless, taking what is mine.

DEMOPHON: Then you will not return to Argos easily.

HERALD: I will find this out right now by trying. [*He advances towards the children. Demophon makes a threatening gesture.*]

DEMOPHON: Touch them and you'll regret it right away! [270]

CHORUS-LEADER: In the name of the gods, do not dare to strike a herald!

DEMOPHON: I will, unless the herald learns to have some sense.

CHORUS-LEADER [*To the Herald*]: Go away! And you, my lord, do not touch this man.

HERALD: I am on my way; for one man's fighting power is weak. But I will return here [275] with a great force of bronze-clad Argives. Ten thousand warriors await me, with king Eurystheus himself as general. He is standing by on the very edge of Alcathous' land, waiting for the outcome of events here. And when he hears of your insolence, he will appear fiercely [280] against you and your citizens, this land and its crops. For to no avail would we possess such a large army of young men in Argos if we did not punish you.

DEMOPHON: To hell with you! [*The Herald begins to leave*] I do not fear this Argos of yours! You were not going to drag [285] these children from here by force and shame me. For this city I rule is not subject to Argives but free!

CHORUS: *It is time to think ahead, before the Argive army nears our*

μάλα δ' ὀξὺς Ἄρης ὁ Μυκηναίων,
ἐπὶ τοῖσι δὲ δὴ μᾶλλον ἔτ' ἢ πρίν.
πᾶσι γὰρ οὗτος κήρυξι νόμος,
δὶς τόσα πυργοῦν τῶν γιγνομένων.
πόσα νιν λέξειν βασιλεῦσι δοκεῖς,
ὡς δεῖν' ἔπαθεν καὶ παρὰ μικρὸν
ψυχὴν ἦλθεν διακναῖσαι;

Io. οὐκ ἔστι τοῦδε παισὶ κάλλιον γέρας
ἢ πατρὸς ἐσθλοῦ κἀγαθοῦ πεφυκέναι
[γαμεῖν τ' ἀπ' ἐσθλῶν· ὃς δὲ νικηθεὶς πόθῳ
κακοῖς ἐκοινώνησεν οὐκ ἐπαινέσω,
τέκνοις ὄνειδος οὕνεχ' ἡδονῆς λιπεῖν]·
τὸ δυστυχὲς γὰρ ηὐγένει' ἀμύνεται
τῆς δυσγενείας μᾶλλον· ἡμεῖς γὰρ κακῶν
ἐς τοὔσχατον πεσόντες ηὕρομεν φίλους
καὶ ξυγγενεῖς τούσδ', οἳ τοσῆσδ' οἰκουμένης
Ἑλληνίδος γῆς τῶνδε προύστησαν μόνοι.
δότ', ὦ τέκν', αὐτοῖς χεῖρα δεξιάν, δότε,
ὑμεῖς τε παισί, καὶ πέλας προσέλθετε.
ὦ παῖδες, ἐς μὲν πεῖραν ἤλθομεν φίλων·
ἦν δ' οὖν ποθ' ὑμῖν νόστος ἐς πάτραν φανῇ
καὶ δώματ' οἰκήσητε καὶ τιμὰς πατρός
< >
σωτῆρας αἰεὶ καὶ φίλους νομίζετε,
καὶ μήποτ' ἐς γῆν ἐχθρὸν αἴρεσθαι δόρυ
μέμνησθέ μοι τήνδ', ἀλλὰ φιλτάτην πόλιν
πασῶν νομίζετ'. ἄξιοι δ' ὑμῖν σέβειν
οἳ γῆν τοσήνδε καὶ Πελασγικὸν λεὼν
ἡμῶν ἀπηλλάξαντο πολεμίους ἔχειν,
πτωχοὺς ἀλήτας εἰσορῶντες ἀλλ' ὅμως
[οὐκ ἐξέδωκαν οὐδ' ἀπήλασαν χθονός].
ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ζῶν καὶ θανών, ὅταν θάνω,
πολλῷ σ' ἐπαίνῳ Θησέως, ὦ τᾶν, πέλας

299-301 deleted by Niejahr
311 lacuna indicated by Elmsley: <πάλιν λάβητε, τῆσδε κοιράνους χθονὸς>
314 μέμνησθέ μοι Kirchhoff: μεμνημένοι L τήνδ' Murray: τῶνδ' L
319 deleted by Diggle (suspected by Wecklein)

borders. The warlike spirit of the Mycenaeans is very keen, [290] *and after this it will be even more so than before. For this is the custom of all heralds, to build up events twice the size of what happened. What great lies do you imagine he will tell his masters, how he suffered terrible things* [295] *and barely escaped being torn apart?*

IOLAUS: There is no finer gift for children than to be born of a noble and virtuous father [and to marry nobility. But I shall not praise the man who, overwhelmed by desire, has intercourse with the low-born, [300] and for the sake of pleasure leaves behind reproach for his children.] For noble birth resists misfortune better than low birth. We, for example, had fallen into the utmost sufferings but found these friends and kinsmen, who, alone in the whole [305] inhabited expanse of Greece, defended these children. Give them your right hands, children, give them, and you likewise to the children, and come close! [*The children clasp hands with the Chorus*]

Children, we have put our friends to the test. So if ever you return to your native land [310] and live in your home and regain your father's rights, consider the rulers of this land for ever your saviours and friends. And remember, I ask you, never to raise a hostile spear against this land, but consider the city dearest of all. They are worthy of your reverence, [315] since they removed the mighty land and army of Argos from us so as to incur their enmity, although they saw that we were destitute wanderers [they did not hand us over or drive us from the land]. In life and in death, when I die, [320] I shall exalt you with much praise, sir, in the presence of Theseus, and shall please him

ὑψηλὸν ἀρῶ καὶ λέγων τάδ' εὐφρανῶ,
ὡς εὖ τ' ἐδέξω καὶ τέκνοισιν ἤρκεσας
τοῖς Ἡρακλείοις, εὐγενὴς δ' ἀν' Ἑλλάδα
σώζεις πατρῴαν δόξαν, ἐξ ἐσθλῶν δὲ φὺς
οὐδὲν κακίων τυγχάνεις γεγὼς πατρός,
παύρων μετ' ἄλλων· ἕνα γὰρ ἐν πολλοῖς ἴσως
εὕροις ἂν ὅστις ἐστὶ μὴ χείρων πατρός.
Χο. ἀεί ποθ' ἥδε γαῖα τοῖς ἀμηχάνοις
σὺν τῷ δικαίῳ βούλεται προσωφελεῖν.
τοιγὰρ πόνους δὴ μυρίους ὑπὲρ φίλων
ἤνεγκε καὶ νῦν τόνδ' ἀγῶν' ὁρῶ πέλας.
Δη. σοί τ' εὖ λέλεκται καὶ τὰ τῶνδ' αὐχῶ, γέρον,
τοιαῦτ' ἔσεσθαι· μνημονεύσεται χάρις.
κἀγὼ μὲν ἀστῶν σύλλογον ποιήσομαι,
τάξω δ' ὅπως ἂν τὸν Μυκηναίων στρατὸν
πολλῇ δέχωμαι χειρί· πρῶτα μὲν σκοποὺς
πέμψω πρὸς αὐτόν, μὴ λάθῃ με προσπεσών·
ταχὺς γὰρ Ἄργει πᾶς ἀνὴρ βοηδρόμος·
μάντεις τ' ἀθροίσας θύσομαι. σὺ δ' ἐς δόμους
σὺν παισὶ χώρει, Ζηνὸς ἐσχάραν λιπών.
εἰσὶν γὰρ οἵ σου, κἂν ἐγὼ θυραῖος ὦ,
μέριμναν ἔξουσ'. ἀλλ' ἴθ' ἐς δόμους, γέρον.
Ιο. οὐκ ἂν λίποιμι βωμόν, ἐυξόμεσθα δὲ
ἱκέται μένοντες ἐνθάδ' εὖ πρᾶξαι πόλιν.
ὅταν δ' ἀγῶνος τοῦδ' ἀπαλλαχθῇς καλῶς,
ἴμεν πρὸς οἴκους. θεοῖσι δ' οὐ κακίοσιν
χρώμεσθα συμμάχοισιν Ἀργείων, ἄναξ·
τῶν μὲν γὰρ Ἥρα προστατεῖ, Διὸς δάμαρ,
ἡμῶν δ' Ἀθάνα. φημὶ δ' εἰς εὐπραξίαν
καὶ τοῦθ' ὑπάρχειν, θεῶν ἀμεινόνων τυχεῖν·
νικωμένη γὰρ Παλλὰς οὐκ ἀνέξεται.

Χο. εἰ σὺ μέγ' αὐχεῖς, ἕτεροι [στρ.
σοῦ πλέον οὐ μέλονται,
ξεῖν' <ἀπ> Ἀργόθεν ἐλθών,
μεγαληγορίαισι δ' ἐμὰς φρένας οὐ φοβήσεις.
μήπω ταῖς μεγάλαισιν οὔ-

355 <ἀπ'> Erfurdt

by telling how you kindly received and protected the children of Heracles, and how, true to your birth, you preserve your father's reputation throughout Greece, and, born of noble parents, [325] you are not actually inferior to your father in any way, as few others are; for you might find one man among many, perhaps, who is no worse than his father.

CHORUS-LEADER: This land has always wanted to help the weak in accordance with justice. [330] It has for this reason endured countless labours on behalf of friends, and now too I see such a struggle close by.

DEMOPHON: You have spoken well, old man, and I am confident that these children will do just as you say: our favour will be remembered. I shall muster the citizens [335] and draw them up so as to receive the army of the Mycenaeans with a powerful force: first I shall send look-outs to it so that it does not attack me by surprise, for every man in Argos is quickly mobilized; then I shall assemble the seers and arrange sacrifices. As for you, go into the palace [340] with the children, leaving the altar of Zeus. For there are people there who will care for you, even though I am away. Come, go into the palace, old man.

IOLAUS: I will not leave the altar, but we will remain here as suppliants and pray for the city's success. [345] And when you have acquitted yourself well in this contest, we will go to the palace. The gods we have as allies are no worse than those of the Argives, my lord. For their defender is Hera, Zeus' wife, but ours is Athena. And I declare that this too is a basis for success, [350] to get the support of better gods. For Pallas will not endure being defeated.

Demophon and Acamas leave by Eisodos B.

CHORUS [Strophe]: *Though you are greatly confident, others do not attend to you more, stranger from Argos,* [355] *and your big talk will put no*

τω καὶ καλλιχόροις Ἀθά-
ναις εἴη. σὺ δ' ἄφρων ὅ τ' Ἄρ-
γει Σθενέλου τύραννος·

ὃς πόλιν ἐλθὼν ἑτέραν [ἀντ.
οὐδὲν ἐλάσσον' Ἄργους
θεῶν ἱκτῆρας ἀλάτας
καὶ ἐμᾶς χθονὸς ἀντομένους ξένος ὢν βιαίως
ἔλκεις, οὐ βασιλεῦσιν εἶ-
ξας, οὐκ ἄλλο δίκαιον εἰ-
πών· ποῦ ταῦτα καλῶς ἂν εἴ-
η παρά γ' εὖ φρονοῦσιν;

εἰρήνα μὲν ἔμοιγ' ἀρέ- [ἐπῳδ.
σκει· σοὶ δ', ὦ κακόφρων ἄναξ,
λέγω, εἰ πόλιν ἥξεις,
οὐχ οὕτως ἃ δοκεῖς κυρή-
σεις· οὐ σοὶ μόνῳ ἔγχος οὐδ'
ἰτέα κατάχαλκός ἐστιν.
ἀλλ', ὡ πολέμων ἐρα-
στά, μή μοι δορί συνταρά-
ξῃς τὰν εὖ χαρίτων ἔχου-
σαν πόλιν, ἀλλ' ἀνάσχου.

Io. ὦ παῖ, τί μοι σύννοιαν ὄμμασιν φέρων
ἥκεις; νέον τι πολεμίων λέξεις πέρι;
μέλλουσιν ἢ πάρεισιν ἢ τί πυνθάνῃ;
οὐ γάρ τι μὴ ψεύσῃς γε κήρυκος λόγους·
ὁ γὰρ στρατηγὸς εὐτυχὴς τὰ πρόσθεν ὤν
εἶσιν, σάφ' οἶδα, καὶ μάλ' οὐ σμικρὸν φρονῶν
ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας. ἀλλά τοι φρονημάτων
ὁ Ζεὺς κολαστὴς τῶν ἄγαν ὑπερφρόνων.
Δη. ἥκει στράτευμ' Ἀργεῖον Εὐρυσθεύς τ' ἄναξ·
ἐγώ νιν αὐτὸς εἶδον. ἄνδρα γὰρ χρεών,

---

365 ἀντόμενους Nauck: ἀντεχομένους L
372 σοὶ Canter: σὺ L
379 εὖ χαρίτων Elmsley: εὐχαρίστως L
385 πρόσθεν ὤν Tyrwhitt: πρὸς θεῶν L

fear in my heart. May this never befall great Athens with her beautiful dancing-grounds! You are a fool, [360] *and so is Argos' ruler, the son of Sthenelus.*

[Antistrophe:] *You came to another city, not at all inferior to Argos, and though you are a foreigner, you try to drag away by force suppliants of the gods, wanderers, refugees in my land,* [365] *not submitting to our kings or making any just claim besides. How could such things be right in the judgement of sensible men?* [370]

[Epode:] *Peace is pleasing to me at any rate. But I say to you, ill-minded king, if you come to this city, you will not simply achieve what you think you will. You are not the only one with a spear* [375] *and bronze-covered shield. But, O lover of wars, do not, I tell you, throw into chaos with your spear the city that abounds in graces, but hold back!* [380]

Demophon returns by Eisodos B.

IOLAUS: My son, why do you come with worry in your eyes? Will you report some bad news about the enemy? Are they waiting, or are they already here, or what have you found out? For you will certainly not prove the herald's words false at any rate: the general, who has enjoyed good fortune before, [385] will come, I know it well, and with no meek thoughts towards Athens. But, let me tell you, Zeus punishes those whose thoughts are excessively proud.

DEMOPHON: The Argive army has arrived with Eurystheus, their king. I have seen them myself. For a man who [390] claims expert knowledge

ὅστις στρατηγεῖν φησ' ἐπίστασθαι καλῶς,
οὐκ ἀγγέλοισι τοὺς ἐναντίους ὁρᾶν.
πεδία μὲν οὖν γῆς ἐς τάδ' οὐκ ἐφῆκέ πω
στρατόν, λεπαίαν δ' ὀφρύην καθήμενος
σκοπεῖ (δόκησιν δὴ τόδ' ἂν λέγοιμί σοι)
ποίᾳ προσάξει στρατόπεδον †τὰ νῦν δορὸς†
ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ τε τῇσδ' ἱδρύσεται χθονός.
καὶ τἀμὰ μέντοι πάντ' ἄραρ' ἤδη καλῶς·
πόλις τ' ἐν ὅπλοις σφάγιά θ' ἡτοιμασμένα
ἕστηκεν οἷς χρὴ ταῦτα τέμνεσθαι θεῶν,
θυηπολεῖται δ' ἄστυ μάντεων ὕπο.
χρησμῶν δ' ἀοιδοὺς πάντας εἰς ἓν ἁλίσας
ἤλεγξα καὶ βέβηλα καὶ κεκρυμμένα
[λόγια παλαιά τῇδε γῇ σωτήρια]·
καὶ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων διάφορ' ἐστὶ θεσφάτοις
πόλλ'· ἓν δὲ πᾶσι γνῶμα ταὐτὸν ἐμπρέπει·
σφάξαι κελεύουσίν με παρθένον κόρῃ
Δήμητρος, ἥτις ἐστὶ πατρὸς εὐγενοῦς,
τροπαῖά τ' ἐχθρῶν καὶ πόλει σωτηρίαν.
ἐγὼ δ' ἔχω μέν, ὡς ὁρᾷς, προθυμίαν
τοσήνδ' ἐς ὑμᾶς· παῖδα δ' οὔτ' ἐμὴν κτενῶ
οὔτ' ἄλλον ἀστῶν τῶν ἐμῶν ἀναγκάσω
ἄκονθ'· ἑκὼν δὲ τίς κακῶς οὕτω φρονεῖ,
ὅστις τὰ φίλτατ' ἐκ χερῶν δώσει τέκνα;
καὶ νῦν πυκνὰς ἂν συστάσεις ἂν εἰσίδοις,
τῶν μὲν λεγόντων ὡς δίκαιος ἦ ξένοις
ἱκέταις ἀρήγειν, τῶν δὲ μωρίαν ἐμοῦ
κατηγορούντων· εἰ δὲ δὴ δράσω τόδε,
οἰκεῖος ἤδη πόλεμος ἐξαρτύεται.
ταῦτ' οὖν ὅρα σὺ καὶ συνεξεύρισχ' ὅπως
αὐτοί τε σωθήσεσθε καὶ πέδον τόδε,
κἀγὼ πολίταις μὴ διαβληθήσομαι.
οὐ γὰρ τυραννίδ' ὥστε βαρβάρων ἔχω·

---

396 τοὐνθένδ' ὅροις Bothe
405 deleted by Wilamowitz
402 transposed by Diggle (after Murray) σωτηρίαν Diggle: σωτήρια L
415 πυκνὰς Bothe: πικρὰς L

of how to be a general should not view his opponents through the eyes of messengers. In fact, he has not yet launched his army into the plain here, but sitting upon a rocky brow, he is looking to see (I will tell you here merely my opinion) [395] by what route he can lead his army from there to our borders and establish it safely in this land.

In the meantime all my own preparations have been properly made: the city is armed, the sacrificial victims stand ready for the gods to whom they must be slaughtered, [400] and the city is filled with the sacrifices of seers. I assembled all the chanters of oracles in one place and questioned them on both public and secret matters [old oracles bringing salvation to this land]. [405] On other points there are many differences in the oracles, but one judgement is conspicuous in them all: they order me to sacrifice to the daughter of Demeter a virgin girl who is born of a noble father, which will mean the rout of the enemy and salvation for the city.

Now I am, as you see, very eager [410] to help you, but I shall not kill my own daughter or compel any of my citizens to do so against his will. Is there a man so base by choice that he would hand over his beloved children? And now you will see crowded meetings, [415] some saying that I was right to protect foreign suppliants, and others accusing me of foolishness. If I then do this, civil war will break out immediately. So you consider these things and join me in finding out how [420] both you and this land may be saved and I may avoid conflict with the citizens. For my rule is not like that of

ἀλλ', ἢν δίκαια δρῶ, δίκαια πείσομαι.
Χο. ἀλλ' ἦ πρόθυμον οὖσαν οὐκ ἐᾷ θεὸς
ξένοις ἀρήγειν τήνδε χρῄζουσιν πόλιν;
Ιο. ὦ τέκν', ἔοιγμεν ναυτίλοισιν οἵτινες
χειμῶνος ἐκφυγόντες ἄγριον μένος
ἐς χεῖρα γῇ συνῆψαν, εἶτα χερσόθεν
πνοιαῖσιν ἠλάθησαν ἐς πόντον πάλιν.
οὕτω δὲ χἠμεῖς τῆσδ' ἀπωθούμεσθα γῆς
ἤδη πρὸς ἀκταῖς ὄντες ὡς σεσωμένοι.
οἴμοι· τί δῆτ' ἔτερψας ὦ τάλαινά με
ἐλπὶς τότ', οὐ μέλλουσα διατελεῖν χάριν;
συγγνωστὰ γάρ τοι καὶ τὰ τοῦδ', εἰ μὴ θέλει
κτείνειν πολιτῶν παῖδας, αἰνέσαι δ' ἔχω
καὶ τἀνθάδ'· εἰ θεοῖσι δὴ δοκεῖ τάδε
πράσσειν ἔμ', οὗτοι σοί γ' ἀπόλλυται χάρις.
ὦ παῖδες, ὑμῖν δ' οὐκ ἔχω τί χρήσομαι.
ποῖ τρεψόμεσθα; τίς γὰρ ἄστεπτος θεῶν;
ποῖον δὲ γαίας ἔρκος οὐκ ἀφίγμεθα;
ὀλούμεθ', ὦ τέκν', ἐκδοθησόμεσθα δή.
κἀμοῦ μὲν οὐδὲν εἴ με χρὴ θανεῖν μέλει,
πλὴν εἴ τι τέρψω τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἐχθροὺς θανών·
ὑμᾶς δὲ κλαίω καὶ κατοικτίρω, τέκνα,
καὶ τὴν γεραιὰν μητέρ' Ἀλκμήνην πατρός.
ὦ δυστάλαινα τοῦ μακροῦ βίου σέθεν,
τλήμων δὲ κἀγὼ πολλὰ μοχθήσας μάτην.
χρῆν χρῆν ἄρ' ἡμᾶς ἀνδρὸς εἰς ἐχθροῦ χέρας
πεσόντας αἰσχρῶς καὶ κακῶς λιπεῖν βίον.
ἀλλ' οἶσθ' ὅ μοι σύμπραξον· οὐχ ἅπασα γὰρ
πέφευγεν ἐλπὶς τῶνδέ μοι σωτηρίας.
ἔμ' ἔκδος Ἀργείοισιν ἀντὶ τῶνδ', ἄναξ,
καὶ μήτε κινδύνευε σωθήτω τέ μοι
τέκν'· οὐ φιλεῖν δεῖ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν· ἴτω.
μάλιστα δ' Εὐρυσθεύς με βούλοιτ' ἂν λαβὼν
τὸν Ἡράκλειον σύμμαχον καθυβρίσαι·
σκαιὸς γὰρ ἀνήρ. τοῖς σοφοῖς δ' εὐκτὸν σοφῷ

436 αἰνέσαι Valckenaer: -σας L
437 <δὲ> θεοῖσι Hermann
443 κἀμοὶ Stephanus

barbarians; but, if I act justly, I will be treated justly.

CHORUS-LEADER: How can it be that god does not allow [425] this city to protect strangers who need its help, although it is eager to?

IOLAUS: Children, we are like sailors who, having escaped the wild fury of the storm, are only a hand's breadth from the shore, but then are driven by winds from dry land back out to sea again. [430] Thus are we being pushed away from this land, though we are already at its shores like people saved. Ah! Why did you give me joy before, cruel hope, when you did not mean to complete the favour? For this man's actions are certainly pardonable, if he is unwilling [435] to kill his citizen's children, and I can accept events even here. If the gods think it right that I should suffer this way, my gratitude to you at any rate is not thereby destroyed.

Children, I do not know what to do for you. Where shall we turn? Which god have we not garlanded? [440] What land have we not come to for protection? We shall die, children; we are about to be handed over! I do not care for myself if I must die, unless by dying I give my enemies some pleasure. But it is for you I weep and feel pity, children, [445] and for Alcmene, the aged mother of your father. O how unfortunate you are in your long life, and I too am miserable, having toiled so much for nothing! It was fated, fated, as it seems, that we fall into the hands of an enemy and die shamefully and wretchedly! [450]

But you must help me do something, I tell you; for not all hope of saving these children has left me. Hand me over to the Argives in place of these children, my lord, and do not endanger yourself but, I pray, let the children be saved. I must not cling to my own life; let it go. [455] Eurystheus would particularly like to capture me and humiliate the ally of Heracles, for he is a crass man. Wise men should pray to have a wise man for an enemy, not one of ignorant pride, for

ἔχθραν συνάπτειν, μὴ ἀμαθεῖ φρονήματι·
πολλῆς γὰρ αἰδοῦς καὶ δίκης τις ἂν τύχοι.
Χο. ὦ πρέσβυ, μή νυν τήνδ' ἐπαιτιῶ πόλιν·
τάχ' ἂν γὰρ ἡμῖν ψευδὲς ἀλλ' ὅμως κακὸν
γένοιτ' ὄνειδος ὡς ξένους προυδώκαμεν.
Δη. γενναῖα μὲν τάδ' εἶπας ἀλλ' ἀμήχανα.
οὐ σοῦ χατίζων δεῦρ' ἄναξ στρατηλατεῖ·
τί γὰρ γέροντος ἀνδρὸς Εὐρυσθεῖ πλέον
θανόντος; ἀλλὰ τούσδε βούλεται κτανεῖν.
δεινὸν γὰρ ἐχθροῖς βλαστάνοντες εὐγενεῖς,
νεανίαι τε καὶ πατρὸς μεμνημένοι
λύμης· ἃ κεῖνον πάντα προσκοπεῖν χρεών.
ἀλλ' εἴ τιν' ἄλλην οἶσθα καιριωτέραν
βουλήν ἑτοίμαζ', ὡς ἔγωγ' ἀμήχανος
χρησμῶν ἀκούσας εἰμὶ καὶ φόβου πλέως.

ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ

ξένοι, θράσος μοι μηδὲν ἐξόδοις ἐμαῖς
προσθῆτε· πρῶτον γὰρ τόδ' ἐξαιτήσομαι·
γυναικὶ γὰρ σιγή τε καὶ τὸ σωφρονεῖν
κάλλιστον εἴσω θ' ἥσυχον μένειν δόμων.
τῶν σῶν δ' ἀκούσασ', Ἰόλεως, στεναγμάτων
ἐξῆλθον, οὐ ταχθεῖσα πρεσβεύειν γένους,
ἀλλ', εἰμὶ γάρ πως πρόσφορος, μέλει δέ μοι
μάλιστ' ἀδελφῶν τῶνδε κἀμαυτῆς πέρι,
θέλω πυθέσθαι μὴ 'πὶ τοῖς πάλαι κακοῖς
προσκείμενόν τι πῆμα σὴν δάκνει φρένα.
Ιο. ὦ παῖ, μάλιστα σ' οὐ νεωστὶ δὴ τέκνων
τῶν Ἡρακλείων ἐνδίκως αἰνεῖν ἔχω.
ἡμῖν δὲ δόξας εὖ προχωρῆσαι δρόμος
πάλιν μεθέστηκ' αὖθις ἐς τἀμήχανον·
χρησμῶν γὰρ ᾠδούς φησι σημαίνειν ὅδε
οὐ ταῦρον οὐδὲ μόσχον ἀλλὰ παρθένον
σφάξαι κόρῃ Δήμητρος ἥτις εὐγενής,
εἰ χρὴ μὲν ἡμᾶς, χρὴ δὲ τήνδ' εἶναι πόλιν.

---

474 Παρθένος Diggle (after Elmsley): μακαρία L (throughout)
486 δρόμος Jacobs: δόμος L
490 κόρηι Δήμητρος Pierson: κελεύειν μητρὸς L

one might then meet with much respect and just treatment. [460]

CHORUS-LEADER: Old man, do not accuse this city. For although it might be false, it would still be an evil reproach to us, that we betrayed strangers.

DEMOPHON: The things you have said are noble but impossible. It is not for need of you that the king leads his army here: [465] what does Eurystheus gain by the death of an old man? No, he wants to kill these children. For the birth of noble offspring is terrifying to enemies, young men who remember the maltreatment of their father. Eurystheus must guard against all this. [470] But if you know of some other plan which better meets the time's need, prepare it, as I am helpless after hearing the oracles and full of fear.

A young woman comes out of the temple of Zeus.

MAIDEN: Strangers, do not impute audacity to me because of my coming out here; this I shall ask of you first. [475] For the best thing for a woman is silence and modesty and staying quietly in the house. However, hearing your lamentations, Iolaus, I have come outside, not appointed to represent the family, but, since I am a fitting person (and I am deeply worried [480] about my brothers here and about myself), I want to find out whether some new misery, added to our old misfortunes, is troubling your heart.

IOLAUS: My dear girl, now as before I can justly praise you most among the children of Heracles. [485] Our course, which appeared to us to proceed well, has changed back again to a helpless state. For this man says that the singers of oracles direct us to sacrifice not a bull or a calf but a virgin of noble birth to the daughter of Demeter, [490] if we are to survive and this city too. We are therefore at a loss, for this man

ταῦτ' οὖν ἀμηχανοῦμεν· οὔτε γὰρ τέκνα
σφάξειν ὅδ' αὐτοῦ φησιν οὔτ' ἄλλου τινός.
κἀμοὶ λέγει μὲν οὐ σαφῶς, λέγει δέ πως,
εἰ μή τι τούτων ἐξαμηχανήσομεν,
ἡμᾶς μὲν ἄλλην γαῖαν εὑρίσκειν τινά,
αὐτὸς δὲ σῶσαι τήνδε βούλεσθαι χθόνα.
Πα. ἐν τῷδε κἀχόμεσθα σωθῆναι λόγῳ;
Ιο. ἐν τῷδε, τἄλλα γ' εὐτυχῶς πεπραγότες.
Πα. μή νυν τρέσῃς ἔτ' ἐχθρὸν Ἀργείων δόρυ·
ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτὴ πρὶν κελευσθῆναι, γέρον,
θνήσκειν ἑτοίμη καὶ παρίστασθαι σφαγῇ.
τί φήσομεν γάρ, εἰ πόλις μὲν ἀξιοῖ
κίνδυνον ἡμῶν οὕνεκ' αἴρεσθαι μέγαν,
αὐτοὶ δὲ προστιθέντες ἄλλοισιν πόνους,
παρόν σφε σῶσαι, φευξόμεσθα μὴ θανεῖν;
οὐ δῆτ', ἐπεί τοι καὶ γέλωτος ἄξια,
στένειν μὲν ἱκέτας δαιμόνων καθημένους,
πατρὸς δ' ἐκείνου φύντας οὗ πεφύκαμεν
κακοὺς ὁρᾶσθαι· ποῦ τάδ' ἐν χρηστοῖς πρέπει;
κάλλιον, οἶμαι, τῆσδ'-ὃ μὴ τύχοι ποτέ-
πόλεως ἁλούσης χεῖρας εἰς ἐχθρῶν πεσεῖν
κἄπειτ' ἄτιμα πατρὸς οὖσαν εὐγενοῦς
παθοῦσαν Ἅιδην μηδὲν ἧσσον εἰσιδεῖν.
ἀλλ' ἐκπεσοῦσα τῆσδ' ἀλητεύσω χθονός;
κοὐκ αἰσχυνοῦμαι δῆτ', ἐὰν δή τις λέγῃ
Τί δεῦρ' ἀφίκεσθ' ἱκεσίοισι σὺν κλάδοις
αὐτοὶ φιλοψυχοῦντες; ἔξιτε χθονός·
κακοῖς γὰρ ἡμεῖς οὐ προσωφελήσομεν.
ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέντοι, τῶνδε μὲν τεθνηκότων,
αὐτὴ δὲ σωθεῖσ', ἐλπίδ' εὖ πράξειν ἔχω·
πολλοὶ γὰρ ἤδη τῇδε προύδοσαν φίλους.
τίς γὰρ κόρην ἔρημον ἢ δάμαρτ' ἔχειν
ἢ παιδοποιεῖν ἐξ ἐμοῦ βουλήσεται;
οὔκουν θανεῖν ἄμεινον ἢ τούτων τυχεῖν
ἀναξίαν; ἄλλῃ δὲ κἂν πρέποι τινὶ

---

506 σφε σῶσαι Nauck: σεσῶσθαι L
513 κἄπειτ' ἄτιμα Kirchhoff: κἄπειτα τινὰ L
515 ἀλητεύσω Stephanus: -εύω L

says that he will sacrifice neither his own children nor anyone else's. And he tells me, not clearly but he hints, that unless we find some way out of these difficulties, [495] we must find some other land, since he himself wishes to save this country.

MAIDEN: Are we actually bound by this condition as regards our safety?

IOLAUS: Yes; otherwise we have fared successfully.

MAIDEN: Then do not fear the Argives' enemy spear any longer. [500] For before I am ordered, old man, I myself am ready to stand by for sacrifice and to die. For what shall we say if this city sees fit to undertake great danger on our behalf, but we ourselves, who have imposed toils upon others, [505] flee from death when it is possible for us to save them? It cannot be, for it is surely worthy of mockery if we who sit groaning as suppliants of the gods are seen to be cowards, although we are sprung from such a father as ours. How can such things be fitting in the eyes of honourable men? [510] It would be finer, I suppose, if this city were captured (may it never happen!) and I fell into enemy hands, and then, having suffered dishonourably for being the daughter of a noble father, I faced death just the same!

Or am I to be driven out of this land and become a wanderer? [515] Shall I not feel great shame if someone then says, "Why have you come here with your suppliant branches when you cling to your own lives? Leave the country, for we shall not give help to cowards!" Again, even if these boys died [520] and I survived, I have no hope of happiness (since many before now have betrayed loved ones in this way). For who will want to have a girl without family as his wife or to beget children by me? Is it not better to die than to meet this fate [525]

μᾶλλον τάδ', ἥτις μὴ 'πίσημος ὡς ἐγώ.
ἡγεῖσθ' ὅπου δεῖ σῶμα κατθανεῖν τόδε
καὶ στεμματοῦτε καὶ †κατάρχεσθ' εἰ δοκεῖ†·
νικᾶτε δ' ἐχθρούς· ἥδε γὰρ ψυχὴ πάρα
ἑκοῦσα κοὐκ ἄκουσα, κἀξαγγέλλομαι
θνήσκειν ἀδελφῶν τῶνδε κἀμαυτῆς ὕπερ.
εὕρημα γάρ τοι μὴ φιλοψυχοῦσ' ἐγὼ
κάλλιστον ηὕρηκ', εὐκλεῶς λιπεῖν βίον.
Χο. φεῦ φεῦ, τί λέξω παρθένου μέγαν λόγον
κλύων, ἀδελφῶν ἣ πάρος θέλει θανεῖν;
τούτων τίς ἂν λέξειε γενναίους λόγους
μᾶλλον, τίς ἂν δράσειεν ἀνθρώπων ἔτι;
Ιο. ὦ τέκνον, οὐκ ἔστ' ἄλλοθεν τὸ σὸν κάρα
ἀλλ' ἐξ ἐκείνου· σπέρμα τῆς θείας φρενὸς
πέφυκας Ἡράκλειον· οὐδ' αἰσχύνομαι
τοῖς σοῖς λόγοισι, τῇ τύχῃ δ' ἀλγύνομαι.
ἀλλ' ᾗ γένοιτ' ἂν ἐνδικωτέρως φράσω·
πάσας ἀδελφὰς τῆσδε δεῦρο χρὴ καλεῖν,
κᾆθ' ἡ λαχοῦσα θνῃσκέτω γένους ὕπερ·
σὲ δ' οὐ δίκαιον κατθανεῖν ἄνευ πάλου.
Πα. οὐκ ἂν θάνοιμι τῇ τύχῃ λαχοῦσ' ἐγώ·
χάρις γὰρ οὐ πρόσεστι· μὴ λέξῃς, γέρον.
ἀλλ', εἰ μὲν ἐνδέχεσθε καὶ βούλεσθέ μοι
χρῆσθαι προθύμῳ, τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν ἐγὼ
δίδωμ' ἑκοῦσα τοῖσδ', ἀναγκασθεῖσα δ' οὔ.
Ιο. φεῦ·
ὅδ' αὖ λόγος σοι τοῦ πρὶν εὐγενέστερος,
κἀκεῖνος ἦν ἄριστος· ἀλλ' ὑπερφέρεις
τόλμῃ τε τόλμαν καὶ λόγῳ χρηστῷ λόγον.
οὐ μὴν κελεύω γ' οὐδ' ἀπεννέπω, τέκνον,
θνήσκειν σ'· ἀδελφοὺς ‹δ'› ὠφελεῖς θανοῦσα σούς.
Πα. σοφῶς †κελεύεις†· μὴ τρέσῃς μιάσματος
τοὐμοῦ μετασχεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐλευθέρως θάνω,
ἐπεὶ σφαγῆς γε πρὸς τὸ δεινὸν εἶμ' ἐγώ,
εἴπερ πέφυκα πατρὸς οὕπερ εὔχομαι.

557 ‹δ'› Barnes
558 ἔλεξας Nauck
562-3 transposed by Schenkl

which I do not deserve? It would actually be more fitting for some other woman who is not as distinguished as I am.

Lead me where this body must die and garland it and begin the rites, if it seems good. Defeat the enemy! For this life is ready, [530] absolutely willing, and I freely offer to die on behalf of my brothers here and myself. Because by not counting my own life dear I have made the finest discovery, how to die gloriously.

CHORUS-LEADER: Ah! How shall I respond, hearing the great speech of the young woman [535] who is willing to die for her brothers? Who in the world could speak nobler words than these, who could carry out nobler acts?

IOLAUS: My child, you are no one else's but your father's; you are truly the offspring of the god-like [540] spirit of Heracles! And I feel no shame at your words, though I feel pain at your fate. But let me explain how things might be done more fairly. [*Speaking to servants*] You must summon here all this girl's sisters, and let the one who draws the lot die for her family. [545] It is not right that you should die without drawing lots.

MAIDEN: I shall not die through drawing lots by chance. For there is no service in that. Do not speak of it, old man. But if you accept my offer and wish to make use of me in my eagerness, I give my life [550] willingly for these boys, but not if I am forced to.

IOLAUS: Ah! This speech is nobler than your last, and that was supreme. You surpass courage with courage and speech with noble speech. [555] I certainly do not order you to die, child, nor do I forbid you. But by dying you help your brothers.

MAIDEN: You have spoken well. Do not fear that you will share in the pollution at my death, but let me die of my own free will when I go to the terror of sacrifice, if indeed I am born of the father I claim to be.

ἔπου δέ, πρέσβυ· σῇ γὰρ ἐνθανεῖν χερὶ
θέλω, πέπλοις δὲ σῶμ' ἐμὸν κρύψον παρών.
Ιο. οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην σῷ παρεστάναι μόρῳ.
Πα. σὺ δ' ἀλλὰ τοῦδε χρῄζε, μή μ' ἐν ἀρσένων
ἀλλ' ἐν γυναικῶν χερσὶν ἐκπνεῦσαι βίον.
Δη. ἔσται τάδ', ὦ τάλαινα παρθένων, ἐπεὶ
κἀμοὶ τόδ' αἰσχρόν, μή σε κοσμεῖσθαι καλῶς,
πολλῶν ἕκατι, τῆς τε σῆς εὐψυχίας
καὶ τοῦ δικαίου. τλημονεστάτην δέ σε
πασῶν γυναικῶν εἶδον ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐγώ.
ἀλλ', εἴ τι βούλῃ, τούσδε τὸν γέροντά τε
χώρει προσειποῦσ' ὑστάτοις προσφθέγμασιν.
Πα. ὦ χαῖρε, πρέσβυ, χαῖρε καὶ δίδασκέ μοι
τοιούσδε τούσδε παῖδας, ἐς τὸ πᾶν σοφούς,
ὥσπερ σύ, μηδὲν μᾶλλον· ἀρκέσουσι γάρ.
πειρῶ δὲ σῶσαι μὴ θανεῖν, πρόθυμος ὤν·
σοὶ παῖδές ἐσμεν, σαῖν χεροῖν τεθράμμεθα·
ὁρᾷς δὲ κἀμὲ τὴν ἐμὴν ὥραν γάμου
διδοῦσαν, ἀντὶ τῶνδε κατθανουμένην.
ὑμεῖς τ', ἀδελφῶν ἡ παροῦσ' ὁμιλία,
εὐδαιμονοῖτε καὶ γένοιθ' ὑμῖν ὅσων
ἡμὴ πάροιθε καρδία σφαλήσεται.
καὶ τὸν γέροντα τήν τ' ἔσω γραῖαν δόμων
τιμᾶτε πατρὸς μητέρ' Ἀλκμήνην ἐμοῦ
ξένους τε τούσδε. κἂν ἀπαλλαγὴ πόνων
καὶ νόστος ὑμῖν εὑρεθῇ ποτ' ἐκ θεῶν,
μέμνησθε τὴν σώτειραν ὡς θάψαι χρεών·
κάλλιστά τοι δίκαιον· οὐ γὰρ ἐνδεὴς
ὑμῖν παρέστην ἀλλὰ προύθανον γένους.
τάδ' ἀντὶ παίδων ἐστί μοι κειμήλια
καὶ παρθενείας, εἴ τι δὴ κατὰ χθονός.
εἴη γε μέντοι μηδέν· εἰ γὰρ ἔξομεν
κἀκεῖ μερίμνας οἱ θανούμενοι βροτῶν,
οὐκ οἶδ' ὅποι τις τρέψεται· τὸ γὰρ θανεῖν

567 Δη. Heath: Ιο. L
573 ὑστάτοις προσφθέγμασιν Blomfield: ὕστατον πρόσφθεγμά μοι L
576 ἀρκέσουσι Stephanus: ἀρέσκουσι L
583 σφαλήσεται Badham: σφαγήσεται L

But come with me, old man, for I want to die in your arms, [560] with you standing by me to cover my body with my robes.

IOLAUS: I could not stand by at your death.

MAIDEN: Then at least ask this man that I breathe my last not in men's [565] but in women's hands.

DEMOPHON: It shall be so, most pitiable girl, since it would be shameful for me too if you were not buried properly, for many reasons, both for your courage and for justice's sake. You are the bravest [570] of all women my eyes have ever seen. But, if you wish, say your last words of farewell to these boys and the old man before you go.

MAIDEN: Farewell, old man, farewell! Please teach these boys to be like you, wise for every event, [575] and no wiser; for that will suffice. Try with all your heart to save them from death! We are your childen, we have been raised by your hands. You see me giving up my chance of marriage and about to die in place of these boys. [580] And you, my band of brothers here, may you flourish, and may you have those things which my heart will now be denied. Honour the old man and the old woman inside the temple, my father's mother, Alcmene, [585] and these hosts of ours. And if deliverance from your sufferings and a return home are ever granted you by the gods, remember how you ought to bury your saviour: the finest funeral would be right, for I did not fail in standing by you but died on behalf of the family. [590] This is my treasure-store in place of children and my virginity, if there is anything beneath the earth. But I pray there is not! For if we mortals who are about to die are to have concerns even there, I don't know where one can turn. For death [595] is considered suffering's greatest

κακῶν μέγιστον φάρμακον νομίζεται.
Io. ἀλλ', ὦ μέγιστον ἐκπρέπουσ' εὐψυχίᾳ
πασῶν γυναικῶν, ἴσθι, τιμιωτάτη
καὶ ζῶσ' ὑφ' ἡμῶν καὶ θανοῦσ' ἔσῃ πολύ.
καὶ χαῖρε· δυσφημεῖν γὰρ ἄζομαι θεὰν
ἣ σὸν κατῆρκται σῶμα, Δήμητρος κόρην.
ὦ παῖδες, οἰχόμεσθα· λύεται μέλη
λύπῃ· λάβεσθε κἀς ἕδραν μ' ἐρείσατε
αὐτοῦ πέπλοισι τοῖσδε κρύψαντες, τέκνα.
ὡς οὔτε τούτοις ἥδομαι πεπραγμένοις
χρησμοῦ τε μὴ κρανθέντος οὐ βιώσιμον·
μείζων γὰρ ἄτη· συμφορὰ δὲ καὶ τάδε.

Χο. οὔτινά φημι θεῶν ἄτερ ὄλβιον, οὐ βαρύποτμον, [στρ.
ἄνδρα γενέσθαι·
οὐδὲ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀεὶ 'μβεβάναι δόμον
εὐτυχίᾳ· παρὰ δ' ἄλλαν ἄλλα
μοῖρα διώκει .
τὸν μὲν ἀφ' ὑψηλῶν βραχὺν ὦκισε,
τὸν δ' ἰάλητανι εὐδαίμονα τεύχει.
μόρσιμα δ' οὔτι φυγεῖν θέμις, οὐ σοφί-
ᾳ τις ἀπώσεται, ἀλλὰ μάταν ὁ πρό-
θυμος ἀεὶ πόνον ἕξει.

ἀλλὰ σὺ μὴ προπεσὼν τὰ θεῶν φέρε μηδ' ὑπεράλγει [ἀντ.
φροντίδα λύπᾳ·
εὐδόκιμον γὰρ ἔχει θανάτου μέρος
ἁ μελέα πρό τ' ἀδελφῶν καὶ γᾶς,
οὐδ' ἀκλεής νιν
δόξα πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ὑποδέξεται·
ἁ δ' ἀρετὰ βαίνει διὰ μόχθων.
ἄξια μὲν πατρός, ἄξια δ' εὐγενί-
ας τάδε γίγνεται· εἰ δὲ σέβεις θανά-
τοις ἀγαθῶν, μετέχω σοι.

---

604 τέκνα] κάρα Diggle
610 'μβεβάναι Pearson: βεβάναι L
614 ἀτίταν Lobeck, (δὲ) πένητ' Elmsley
619 φέρε Elmsley: ὕπερ L

remedy.

IOLAUS: You who most surpass all women in courage, know that both living and dead you will be by far the one most honoured by us! So farewell! Holy fear prevents me from speaking ill of the goddess [600] to whom your body has been consecrated, Demeter's daughter.

The daughter of Heracles and Demophon leave by Eisodos B.

Children, I am ruined! My limbs are loosened by grief! Take hold of me and set me down beside the altar here, hiding me with these robes, children. I take no pleasure in what has been done here, [605] and if the oracle is not fulfilled, life is not worth living, for my ruin would be even greater; yet what has happened here is catastrophe enough!

The sons of Heracles set Iolaus down beside the altar and cover his head.

CHORUS [Strophe]: *No man, I say, is blessed or endures a heavy fate without the will of the gods. Nor is the same house always well established* [610] *in good fortune, but one fate after another pursues it. One man fate settles from high to low estate, another, a wanderer, it makes successful. To escape what is fated is not permitted,* [615] *nor will anyone ward it off with cleverness, but the man who is keen to do so will always labour in vain.*

[Antistrophe:] *So, Iolaus, do not fall prostrate, but bear the will of the gods, and do not pain your heart excessively with grief.* [620] *For the poor girl has a share in death that is glorious, on behalf of her brothers and this land, and a renowned reputation in men's eyes will welcome her. Excellence comes through toil.* [625] *These deeds are worthy of her father, worthy of her noble birth. If you honour the deaths of brave people, I share your feelings.*

ΘΕΡΑΠΩΝ

ὦ τέκνα, χαίρετ'· Ἰόλεως δὲ ποῦ γέρων
μήτηρ τε πατρὸς τῆσδ' ἔδρας ἀποστατεῖ;
Io. πάρεσμεν, οἵα δή γ' ἐμοῦ παρουσία.
Θε. τί χρῆμα κεῖσαι καὶ κατηφὲς ὄμμ' ἔχεις;
Io. φροντίς τις ἦλθ' οἰκεῖος, ἢ συνειχόμην.
Θε. ἔπαιρέ νυν σεαυτόν, ὄρθωσον κάρα.
Io. γέροντές ἐσμεν κοὐδαμῶς ἐρρώμεθα.
Θε. ἥκω γε μέντοι χάρμα σοι φέρων μέγα.
Io. τίς δ' εἶ σύ; ποῦ σοι συντυχὼν ἀμνημονῶ;
Θε. Ὕλλου πενέστης· οὔ με γιγνώσκεις ὁρῶν;
Io. ὦ φίλταθ', ἥκεις ἆρα σωτὴρ νῷν βλάβης;
Θε. μάλιστα· καὶ πρός γ' εὐτυχεῖς τὰ νῦν τάδε.
Io. ὦ μῆτερ ἐσθλοῦ παιδός, Ἀλκμήνην λέγω,
ἔξελθ', ἄκουσον τοῦδε φιλτάτους λόγους.
πάλαι γὰρ ὠδίνουσα τῶν ἀφιγμένων
ψυχὴν ἐτήκου νόστος εἰ γενήσεται.

ΑΛΚΜΗΝΗ

τί χρῆμ' αὐτῆς πᾶν τόδ' ἐπλήσθη στέγος,
Ἰόλαε; μῶν τίς σ' αὖ βιάζεται παρὼν
κῆρυξ ἀπ' Ἄργους; ἀσθενὴς μὲν ἥ γ' ἐμὴ
ῥώμη, τοσόνδε δ' εἰδέναι σε χρή, ξένε·
οὐκ ἔστ' ἄγειν σε τούσδ' ἐμοῦ ζώσης ποτέ.
ἦ τἄρ' ἐκείνου μὴ νομιζοίμην ἐγὼ
μήτηρ ἔτ'· εἰ δὲ τῶνδε προσθίξῃ χερί,
δυοῖν γερόντοιν οὐ καλῶς ἀγωνιῇ.
Io. θάρσει, γεραιά, μὴ τρέσῃς· οὐκ Ἀργόθεν
κῆρυξ ἀφῖκται πολεμίους λόγους ἔχων.
Αλ. τί γὰρ βοὴν ἔστησας ἄγγελον φόβου;
Io. σὺ πρόσθε ναοῦ τοῦδ' ὅπως βαίης πέλας.
Αλ. οὐκ ἴσμεν ἡμεῖς ταῦτα· τίς γάρ ἐσθ' ὅδε;
Io. ἥκοντα παῖδα παιδὸς ἀγγέλλει σέθεν.
Αλ. ὦ χαῖρε καὶ σὺ τοῖσδε τοῖς ἀγγέλμασιν.
ἀτὰρ τί χώρᾳ τῇδε προσβαλὼν πόδα

---

634 συνειχόμην Elmsley: ἐσχόμην L
640 νῶιν σωτὴρ Porson

A Servant of Hyllus enters by Eisodos A.

SERVANT: Children, greetings to you. Where is old Iolaus [630] and where has your grandmother gone from this altar?

IOLAUS: I am here, so far, at least, as I can be said to be here.

SERVANT: Why are you lying there? And why the dejected look?

IOLAUS: Some personal worry came and I am in its grip.

SERVANT: Then raise yourself, lift your head! [635]

IOLAUS: I am an old man and have no strength at all.

SERVANT: But I come bringing you great joy.

IOLAUS: Who are you? Where did I meet you? I don't remember.

SERVANT: I am Hyllus' servant. Don't you recognize me?

IOLAUS: O dearest friend, have you come to save us from harm? [640]

SERVANT: Certainly; and, what's more, you now enjoy good fortune.

IOLAUS: [*Getting up and shouting towards the temple*] Mother of a noble son, Alcmene, come out! Hear this man's most welcome words! For you have long agonized about the return of those who have now appeared. [645]

Alcmeme comes out of the temple.

ALCMENE: Why has this whole temple been filled with shouting, Iolaus? It's surely not some herald here from Argos treating you violently again? My strength may be weak, but this you should know, stranger: you will never drag these children away while I still live! [650] If so, may I no longer be known as Heracles' mother! If you lay a hand on these children, you will have a shameful struggle with two old people.

IOLAUS: Take courage, old woman, do not be afraid. No herald has come from Argos with hostile words. [655]

ALCMENE: Then why did you raise a shout signalling fear?

IOLAUS: So that you would come here out of this temple.

ALCMENE: I don't understand. Who is this man?

IOLAUS: He reports that your grandson has returned.

ALCMENE [*To the Servant*]: Welcome to you for this report of yours! [660] But why is he not here, if he has set foot in this land, and where is he

ποῦ νῦν ἄπεστι; τίς νιν εἶργε συμφορὰ
σὺν σοὶ φανέντα δεῦρ' ἐμὴν τέρψαι φρένα;
Θε. στρατὸν καθίζει τάσσεταί θ' ὃν ἦλθ' ἔχων.
Αλ. τοῦδ' οὐκέθ' ἡμῖν τοῦ λόγου μέτεστι δή.
Io. μέτεστιν· ἡμῶν δ' ἔργον ἱστορεῖν τάδε.
Θε. τί δῆτα βούλῃ τῶν πεπραγμένων μαθεῖν;
Io. πόσον τι πλῆθος συμμάχων πάρεστ' ἔχων;
Θε. πολλούς· ἀριθμὸν δ' ἄλλον οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι.
Io. ἴσασιν, οἶμαι, ταῦτ' Ἀθηναίων πρόμοι.
Θε. ἴσασι, καὶ δὴ λαιὸν ἕστηκεν κέρας.
Io. ἤδη γὰρ ὡς ἐς ἔργον ὥπλισται στρατός;
Θε. καὶ δὴ παρῆκται σφάγια τάξεων ἑκάς.
Io. πόσον τι δ' ἔστ' ἄπωθεν Ἀργεῖον δόρυ;
Θε. ὥστ' ἐξορᾶσθαι τὸν στρατηγὸν ἐμφανῶς.
Io. τί δρῶντα; μῶν τάσσοντα πολεμίων στίχας;
Θε. ἠκάζομεν ταῦτ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐξηκούομεν.
ἀλλ' εἶμ'· ἐρήμους δεσπότας τοὐμὸν μέρος
οὐκ ἂν θέλοιμι πολεμίοισι συμβαλεῖν.
Io. κἄγωγε σὺν σοί· ταὐτὰ γὰρ φροντίζομεν,
φίλοις παρόντες, ὡς ἔοιγμεν, ὠφελεῖν.
Θε. ἥκιστα πρὸς σοῦ μῶρον ἦν εἰπεῖν ἔπος.
Io. καὶ μὴ μετασχεῖν γ' ἀλκίμου μάχης φίλοις.
Θε. οὐκ ἔστιν, ὦ τᾶν, ἥ ποτ' ἦν ῥώμη σέθεν.
Io. ἀλλ' οὖν μαχοῦμαί γ' ἀριθμὸν οὐκ ἐλάσσοσιν.
Θε. σμικρὸν τὸ σὸν σήκωμα προστίθης φίλοις.
Io. οὐδεὶς ἔμ' ἐχθρῶν προσβλέπων ἀνέξεται.
Θε. οὐκ ἔστ' ἐν ὄψει τραῦμα μὴ δρώσης χερός.
Io. τί δ'; οὐ θένοιμι κἂν ἐγὼ δι' ἀσπίδος;
Θε. θένοις ἄν, ἀλλὰ πρόσθεν αὐτὸς ἂν πέσοις.
Io. μή τοί μ' ἔρυκε δρᾶν παρεσκευασμένον.
Θε. δρᾶν μὲν σύ γ' οὐχ οἷός τε, βούλεσθαι δ' ἴσως.
Io. ὡς μὴ μενοῦντι τἄλλα σοι λέγειν πάρα.
Θε. πῶς οὖν ὁπλίτης τευχέων ἄτερ φανῇ;

683-90 so ordered by Zuntz
685 θένοιμι Pierson: σθέν- L
686 θένοις Pierson: σθέν- L
693 μενοῦντι Diggle: μενοῦντα L
694 ὁπλίτης Elmsley: -ται̣ς L

now? What has kept him from appearing here with you to delight my heart?

SERVANT: He is making camp and marshalling the army that he brought.

ALCMENE: This part of your report no longer concerns us. [665]

IOLAUS: It does; it is our job to enquire into these things.

SERVANT: What then do you wish to learn about what has been done?

IOLAUS: How big an allied force is he here with?

SERVANT: Many men; I can't tell you the number more exactly.

IOLAUS: The Athenian commanders know of this, I suppose. [670]

SERVANT: They do, and in fact he is stationed on their left wing.

IOLAUS: What? Is the army already armed for action?

SERVANT: Yes, and sacrificial victims have been brought up far from the ranks.

IOLAUS: How far off is the Argive army?

SERVANT: Close enough for their general to be seen clearly. [675]

IOLAUS: Doing what? Marshalling the enemy lines probably?

SERVANT: We guessed as much, for we could not hear clearly. But I shall go. I would not want my masters to clash with the enemy deprived of my assistance.

IOLAUS: I too shall go with you. For we think the same way, [680] to be with friends and to help them, as we should.

SERVANT: It was hardly like you to utter a foolish remark.

IOLAUS: And unlike me too not to join friends in stout battle.

SERVANT: Your strength, sir, is not what it once was.

IOLAUS: Still, I shall fight no fewer foes than before.

SERVANT: The weight you add to your friends' side is small. [690]

IOLAUS: None of the enemy will be able to look me in the eye

SERVANT: The mere sight of you cannot wound without an active hand.

IOLAUS: What? May I too not strike through a shield? [685]

SERVANT: You may strike, but you would fall yourself before striking home.

IOLAUS: Do not hold me back when I am prepared to act.

SERVANT: You are not able to act, though you can perhaps want to.

IOLAUS: Say whatever else you want, but be sure that I will not be staying.

SERVANT: So how will you look like a warrior, if you have no weapons?

Io. ἔστ' ἐν δόμοισιν ἔνδον αἰχμάλωθ' ὅπλα
τοῖσδ', οἷσι χρησόμεσθα· κἀποδώσομεν
ζῶντες, θανόντας δ' οὐκ ἀπαιτήσει θεός.
ἀλλ' εἴσιθ' εἴσω κἀπὸ πασσάλων ἑλὼν
ἔνεγχ' ὁπλίτην κόσμον ὡς τάχιστά μοι.
αἰσχρὸν γὰρ οἰκούρημα γίγνεται τόδε,
τοὺς μὲν μάχεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ δειλίᾳ μένειν.

Χο. λῆμα μὲν οὔπω στόρνυσι χρόνος
τὸ σόν, ἀλλ' ἡβᾷ, σῶμα δὲ φροῦδον.
τί πονεῖς ἄλλως ἃ σὲ μὲν βλάψει,
σμικρὰ δ' ὀνήσει πόλιν ἡμετέραν;
χρὴ γνωσιμαχεῖν σὴν ἡλικίαν,
τὰ δ' ἀμήχαν' ἐᾶν· οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως
ἥβην κτήσῃ πάλιν αὖθις.
Αλ. τί χρῆμα μέλλεις σῶν φρενῶν οὐκ ἔνδον ὢν
λιπεῖν μ' ἔρημον σὺν ‹τέκνου› τέκνοις ἐμοῖς;
Io. ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἀλκή· σοὶ δὲ χρὴ τούτων μέλειν.
Αλ. τί δ'; ἢν θάνῃς σύ, πῶς ἐγὼ σωθήσομαι;
Io. παιδὸς μελήσει παισὶ τοῖς λελειμμένοις.
Αλ. ἢν δ' οὖν, ὃ μὴ γένοιτο, χρήσωνται τύχῃ;
Io. οἵδ' οὐ προδώσουσίν σε, μὴ τρέσῃς, ξένοι.
Αλ. τοσόνδε γάρ τοι θάρσος, οὐδὲν ἄλλ' ἔχω.
Io. καὶ Ζηνὶ τῶν σῶν, οἷδ' ἐγώ, μέλει πόνων.
Αλ. φεῦ·
Ζεὺς ἐξ ἐμοῦ μὲν οὐκ ἀκούσεται κακῶς·
εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ὅσιος αὐτὸς οἷδεν εἰς ἐμέ.

Θε. ὅπλων μὲν ἥδη τήνδ' ὁρᾷς παντευχίαν,
φθάνοις δ' ἂν οὐκ ἂν τοῖσδε σὸν κρύπτων δέμας·
ὡς ἐγγὺς ἀγών καὶ μάλιστ' Ἄρης στυγεῖ
μέλλοντας· εἰ δὲ τευχέων φοβῇ βάρος,
νῦν μὲν πορεύου γυμνός, ἐν δὲ τάξεσιν
κόσμῳ πυκάζου τῷδ'· ἐγὼ δ' οἴσω τέως.

---

706 σὴν Porson: τὴν L
710 <τέκνου> Vitelli
713 παισὶ Canter: πᾶσι L
721 σὸν κρύπτων Dobree: συγκρύπτων L

IOLAUS: There are captured weapons inside this temple [695] which I will use. I will return them, if I live, but if I die, the god will not ask for them back. Go inside and take down a warrior's armour from the pegs and bring it to me as quickly as possible. For such staying at home is shameful [700] when some are fighting but others remain behind out of cowardice.

The Servant goes into the temple.

CHORUS: *Time has not yet calmed your spirit, but it is in the prime of youth, though your body is spent. Yet why do you toil in vain at things that will harm you and scarcely benefit our city?* [705] *You should resist such thoughts at your age and leave the impossible alone. There is no way for you to get your youth back again.*

ALCMENE: Why do you intend – you must be out of your mind – to leave me abandoned with my grandchildren? [710]

IOLAUS: Because battle is men's business; you must care for these children.

ALCMENE: What? If you die, how shall I survive?

IOLAUS: Your son's remaining children will take care of that.

ALCMENE: But what if, heaven forbid, something happens to them?

IOLAUS: Our hosts here will not betray you, have no fear. [715]

ALCMENE: Indeed, this is all I have to give me confidence, nothing else.

IOLAUS: And Zeus, I know, cares for your sufferings.

ALCMENE: Ah! Zeus will not hear any reproach from me, but he knows himself if he is loyal to me.

The Servant returns from the temple carrying armour.

SERVANT: You see this full set of armour here; [720] hurry to cover your body with it. For the struggle is at hand and Ares hates delayers most of all. But if you fear the armour's weight, advance unarmed for now and cover yourself with this equipment in the ranks. I'll carry it in the meantime. [725]

Io. καλῶς ἔλεξας· ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ πρόχειρ' ἔχων
τεύχη κόμιζε, χειρὶ δ' ἔνθες ὀξύην,
λαιόν τ' ἔπαιρε πῆχυν, εὐθύνων πόδα.
Θε. ἦ παιδαγωγεῖν γὰρ τὸν ὁπλίτην χρεών;
Io. ὄρνιθος οὕνεκ' ἀσφαλῶς πορευτέον.
Θε. εἴθ' ἦσθα δυνατὸς δρᾶν ὅσον πρόθυμος εἶ.
Io. ἕπειγε· λειφθεὶς δεινὰ πείσομαι μάχης.
Θε. σύ τοι βραδύνεις, οὐκ ἐγώ, δοκῶν τι δρᾶν.
Io. οὔκουν ὁρᾷς μου κῶλον ὡς ἐπείγεται;
Θε. ὁρῶ δοκοῦντα μᾶλλον ἢ σπεύδοντά σε.
Io. οὐ ταῦτα λέξεις ἡνίκ' ἂν λεύσσῃς μ' ἐκεῖ . . .
Θε. τί δρῶντα; βουλοίμην δ' ἂν εὐτυχοῦντά γε.
Io. δι' ἀσπίδος θείνοντα πολεμίων τινά.
Θε. εἰ δή ποθ' ἥξομέν γε· τοῦτο γὰρ φόβος.
Io. φεῦ·
εἴθ', ὦ βραχίων, οἷον ἡβήσαντά σε
μεμνήμεθ' ἡμεῖς, ἡνίκα ξὺν Ἡρακλεῖ
Σπάρτην ἐπόρθεις, σύμμαχος γένοιό μοι
τοιοῦτος· οἵαν ἂν τροπὴν Εὐρυσθέως
θείμην· ἐπεί τοι καὶ κακὸς μένειν δόρυ.
ἔστιν δ' ἐν ὅλβῳ καὶ τόδ' οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἔχον,
εὐψυχίας δόκησις· οἰόμεσθα γὰρ
τὸν εὐτυχοῦντα πάντ' ἐπίστασθαι καλῶς.

Χο. Γᾶ καὶ παννύχιος σελά- [στρ. α
να καὶ λαμπρόταται θεοῦ
φαεσιμβρότου αὐγαί,
ἀγγελίαν μοι ἐνέγκαι,
ἰαχήσατε δ' οὐρανῷ
καὶ παρὰ θρόνον ἀρχέταν
γλαυκᾶς τ' ἐν Ἀθάνας·
μέλλω τᾶς πατριώτιδος
γᾶς, μέλλω καὶ ὑπὲρ δόμων
ἱκέτας ὑποδεχθεὶς
κίνδυνον πολιῷ τεμεῖν σιδάρῳ.

---

733 δοκῶν Tyrwhitt: δοκῶ L
751 ἐνέγκαι Wilamowitz: ἐνέγκατ' L

IOLAUS: Well said. So bring the armour and keep it ready for me, and put the spear in my hand and support my left arm as you guide my steps.

SERVANT: Must I really lead the warrior like a child?

IOLAUS: For the sake of the omen we must proceed without stumbling. [730]

SERVANT: If only you were able to do as much as you are eager to!

IOLAUS: Hurry up! I will be in a terrible state if I miss the battle.

SERVANT: It is you who are slow, not I, imagining you are doing something.

IOLAUS: Don't you see how my legs press on?

SERVANT: I see you imagining it rather than actually hurrying. [735]

IOLAUS: You won't say this when you see me there...

SERVANT: Doing what? Being successful, I would hope.

IOLAUS: ... striking some enemy through his shield!

SERVANT: If, that is, we ever get there; for this is my fear.

IOLAUS: Ah! I wish, arm of mine, you could be such an ally to me [740] as I remember you were in your youth, when you destroyed Sparta with Heracles! How I would make Eurystheus flee! For, let me tell you, he is too cowardly to face the spear. Wealth contains this further feature that isn't right, [745] the appearance of courage. For we think that the prosperous man knows everything well.

Iolaus and the Servant leave by Eisodos A.

CHORUS [Strophe]: *Earth, and moon that shines all night, and brightest rays of the god who brings light to mortals,* [750] *bear a message, I pray, and shout out in heaven beside the ruler's throne and in the house of bright-eyed Athena! On behalf of our native land,* [755] *and of our homes, since I have received the suppliants, I am about to cut through the danger with grey steel!*

δεινὸν μὲν πόλιν ὡς Μυκή- [ἀντ. α
νας εὐδαίμονα καὶ δορὸς
πολυαίνετον ἀλκᾷ
μῆνιν ἐμᾷ χθονὶ κεύθειν·
κακὸν δ', ὦ πόλις, εἰ ξένους
ἱκτῆρας παραδώσομεν
κελεύσμασιν Ἄργους.
Ζεύς μοι σύμμαχος, οὐ φοβοῦ-
μαι, Ζεύς μοι χάριν ἐνδίκως
ἔχει· οὔποτε θνατῶν
ἥσσους ‹δαίμονες› ἔκ γ' ἐμοῦ φανοῦνται.

ἀλλ', ὦ πότνια, σὸν γὰρ οὖ- [στρ. β
δας γᾶς καὶ πόλις, ἃς σὺ μά-
τηρ δέσποινά τε καὶ φύλαξ,
πόρευσον ἄλλᾳ τὸν οὐ δικαίως
τᾷδ' ἐπάγοντα δορυσσοῦν
στρατὸν Ἀργόθεν· οὐ γὰρ ἐμᾷ γ' ἀρετᾷ
δίκαιός εἰμ' ἐκπεσεῖν μελάθρων.

ἐπεί σοι πολύθυτος ἀεὶ [ἀντ. β
τιμὰ κραίνεται οὐδὲ λά-
θει μηνῶν φθινὰς ἀμέρα
νέων τ' ἀοιδαὶ χορῶν τε μολπαί.
ἀνεμόεντι δ' ἐπ' ὄχθῳ
ὀλολύγματα παννυχίοις ὑπὸ παρ-
θένων ἰαχεῖ ποδῶν κρότοισιν.

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ

δέσποινα, μύθους σοί τε †συντομωτάτους
κλύειν ἐμοί τε τῷδε καλλίστους φέρω†·
νικῶμεν ἐχθροὺς καὶ τροπαῖ' ἱδρύεται
παντευχίαν ἔχοντα πολεμίων σέθεν.

---

765 κελεύσμασιν Ἄργους Reiske: καὶ λεύσιμον ἄργος L
769 <δαίμονες> Kirchhoff
784 Ἄγγελος Rassow: θερ. L (throughout)
784-5 σοί τε καλλίστους φέρω / κλύειν ἐμοί τε συντομωτάτους λέγειν Hartung

[Antistrophe:] *It is dreadful that a city as prosperous as Mycenae,* [760] *and so widely praised for its martial strength, should cherish anger against my land. But it is cowardly, my city, if we are to surrender suppliant strangers at the command of Argos.* [765] *Zeus is my ally, I am not afraid, Zeus justly favours me. Never will the gods be shown by me at any rate as inferior to mortals.*

[Strophe:] *But, my Lady, since the land's soil* [770] *and the city are yours, and you are its mother, mistress and protectress, send elsewhere the man who is unjustly leading his spear-brandishing army here from Argos. Because of my goodness* [775] *I do not deserve to be driven from my home.*

[Antistrophe:] *For the honour of much sacrifice is always paid to you, and the waning day of the months is not forgotten, or the songs of young men and dances of their choruses.* [780] *On the windy hill cries of joy resound to the all-night beat of maidens' feet.*

A Messenger arrives by Eisodos A.

MESSENGER: Mistress, I bring you news that is fairest for you to hear, and briefest for me to relate. [785] We have defeated the enemy and a trophy is being set up bearing your enemies' full armour.

Αλ. ὦ φίλταθ', ἥδε σ' ἡμέρα †διήλασεν†·
ἠλευθέρωσαι τοῖσδε τοῖς ἀγγέλμασιν.
μιᾶς δ' ἔμ' οὔπω συμφορᾶς ἐλευθεροῖς·
φόβος γὰρ εἴ μοι ζῶσιν οὓς ἐγὼ θέλω.
Αγ. ζῶσιν, μέγιστόν γ' εὐκλεεῖς κατὰ στρατόν.
Αλ. ὁ μὲν γέρων †οὐκ ἔστιν Ἰόλεως ὅδε†;
Αγ. μάλιστα, πράξας γ' ἐκ θεῶν κάλλιστα δή.
Αλ. τί δ' ἔστι; μῶν τι κεδνὸν ἠγωνίζετο;
Αγ. νέος μεθέστηκ' ἐκ γέροντος αὖθις αὖ.
Αλ. θαυμάστ' ἔλεξας· ἀλλά σ' εὐτυχῆ φίλων
μάχης ἀγῶνα πρῶτον ἀγγεῖλαι θέλω.
Αγ. εἷς μου λόγος σοι πάντα σημανεῖ τάδε.
ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἀλλήλοισιν ὁπλίτην στρατὸν
κατὰ στόμ' ἐκτείνοντες ἀντετάξαμεν,
ἐκβὰς τεθρίππων Ὕλλος ἁρμάτων πόδα
ἔστη μέσοισιν ἐν μεταιχμίοις δορός.
κἄπειτ' ἔλεξεν· Ὦ στρατήγ' ὃς Ἀργόθεν
ἥκεις, τί τήνδε γαῖαν οὐκ εἰάσαμεν
< >
< >
καὶ τὰς Μυκήνας οὐδὲν ἐργάσῃ κακὸν
ἀνδρὸς στερήσας· ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ μόνος μόνῳ
μάχην συνάψας, ἢ κτανὼν ἄγου λαβὼν
τοὺς Ἡρακλείους παῖδας ἢ θανὼν ἐμοὶ
τιμὰς πατρῴους καὶ δόμους ἔχειν ἄφες.
στρατὸς δ' ἐπήνεσ' ἔς τ' ἀπαλλαγὰς πόνων
καλῶς λελέχθαι μῦθον ἔς τ' εὐψυχίαν.
ὃ δ' οὔτε τοὺς κλύοντας αἰδεσθεὶς λόγων
οὔτ' αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ δειλίαν στρατηγὸς ὢν
ἐλθεῖν ἐτόλμησ' ἐγγὺς ἀλκίμου δορός,
ἀλλ' ἦν κάκιστος· εἶτα τοιοῦτος γεγὼς
τοὺς Ἡρακλείους ἦλθε δουλώσων γόνους;
Ὕλλος μὲν οὖν ἀπῴχετ' ἐς τάξιν πάλιν·

---

788 διώλβισεν Diggle
789 ἠλευθέρωσαι Jackson: ἐλευθερῶσαι L
793 οὐκ ... ὅδε] ἆρ' ... ἔτι Bothe, σῶς or ἔτ' ... ; λέγε Diggle
805 lacuna indicated by Heath
807 ἀνδρῶν Hartung

ALCMENE: O dearest friend, this day has brought you great good fortune; you are freed because of this report. But there is one concern from which you do not yet set me free, [790] for I am afraid whether the ones I want to be alive still live.

MESSENGER: They are alive and greatly renowned throughout the army.

ALCMENE: Is old Iolaus still alive too?

MESSENGER: Yes, he certainly is. Indeed, he fared exceptionally well with the gods' help.

ALCMENE: What? You mean he achieved something valuable in the battle? [795]

MESSENGER: He has changed back from an old to a young man again!

ALCMENE: An astonishing story! But first I want to hear you report the successful battle-struggle of our friends.

MESSENGER: One speech from me will make all this clear to you. When we had drawn up the armed troops [800] and deployed them face to face with each other, Hyllus stepped from his four-horse chariot and stood in the middle between the two armies. Then he said, 'General, you who have come from Argos, why can we not let this land [805]

< >

< >

and you will not damage Mycenae by depriving it of men. But rather join with me in battle, one against one, and if you kill me, take the children of Heralces and lead them away, or, if you die, yield to me possession of my ancestral honours and house.' [810] The troops approved his speech both for its release from suffering and for its courage. But Eurystheus, who felt no shame at the hearers or at his own cowardice as general, could not bear to come close in hard conflict, [815] but was an utter coward. And so did such a man come to make slaves of Heracles' children?

Hyllus therefore returned again to the ranks. And when they

μάντεις δ', ἐπειδὴ μονομάχου δι' ἀσπίδος
διαλλαγὰς ἔγνωσαν οὐ τελουμένας,
ἔσφαζον, οὐκ ἔμελλον, ἀλλ' ἀφίεσαν
λαιμῶν βοείων εὐθὺς οὔριον φόνον.
οἱ δ' ἅρματ' εἰσέβαινον, οἱ δ' ὑπ' ἀσπίδων
πλευροῖς ἔχριμπτον πλεύρ'· Ἀθηναίων δ' ἄναξ
στρατῷ παρήγγελλ' οἷα χρὴ τὸν εὐγενῆ·
Ὦ ξυμπολῖται, τῇ τε βοσκούσῃ χθονὶ
καὶ τῇ τεκούσῃ νῦν τιν' ἀρκέσαι χρεών.
ὃ δ' αὖ τό τ' Ἄργος μὴ καταισχῦναι θέλειν
καὶ τὰς Μυκήνας συμμάχους ἐλίσσετο.
ἐπεὶ δ' ἐσήμην' ὄρθιον Τυρσηνικῇ
σάλπιγγι καὶ συνῆψαν ἀλλήλοις μάχην,
πόσον τιν' αὐχεῖς πάταγον ἀσπίδων βρέμειν,
πόσον τινὰ στεναγμὸν οἰμωγήν θ' ὁμοῦ;
τὰ πρῶτα μέν νυν πίτυλος Ἀργείου δορὸς
ἐρρήξαθ' ἡμᾶς, εἶτ' ἐχώρησαν πάλιν.
τὸ δεύτερον δὲ ποὺς ἐπαλλαχθεὶς ποδί,
ἀνὴρ δ' ἐπ' ἀνδρὶ στάς, ἐκαρτέρει μάχῃ·
πολλοὶ δ' ἔπιπτον. ἦν δὲ †του κελεύσματος†
Ὦ τὰς Ἀθήνας-Ὦ τὸν Ἀργείων γύην
σπείροντες-οὐκ ἀρήξετ' αἰσχύνην πόλει;
μόλις δὲ πάντα δρῶντες οὐκ ἄτερ πόνων
ἐτρεψάμεσθ' Ἀργεῖον ἐς φυγὴν δόρυ.
κἀνταῦθ' ὁ πρέσβυς Ὕλλον ἐξορμώμενον
ἰδών, ὀρέξας ἱκέτευσε δεξιὰν
Ἰόλαος ἐμβῆσαί νιν ἵππειον δίφρον.
λαβὼν δὲ χερσὶν ἡνίας Εὐρυσθέως
πώλοις ἐπεῖχε. τἀπὸ τοῦδ' ἤδη κλύων
λέγοιμ' ἂν ἄλλων, δεῦρο γ' αὐτὸς εἰσιδών.
Παλληνίδος γὰρ σεμνὸν ἐκπερῶν πάγον
δίας Ἀθάνας, ἅρμ' ἰδὼν Εὐρυσθέως,
ἠράσθ' Ἥβῃ Ζηνί θ' ἡμέραν μίαν
νέος γενέσθαι κἀποτείσασθαι δίκην
ἐχθρούς. κλύειν δὴ θαύματος πάρεστί σοι·

---

822 βοείων Helbig: βροτείων L
824 ἔχριμπτον Diggle: ἔκρυπτον L
838 δύο κελεύσματα L. Dindorf, τὼ κελεύσματε Haupt, ὁμοῦ κελεύματα Murray

realized that resolution would not be achieved by single combat [820] the seers began to sacrifice; they did not delay, but immediately released the propitious blood from the oxen's throats. Some boarded chariots, others brought flank close to flank beneath their shields. The Athenian king encouraged his army as a noble man should: [825] 'Fellow citizens, now must each man defend the land that nurtures him and gave him birth!' The other was in turn exhorting his allies not to disgrace Argos and Mycenae.

When the Tyrrhenian trumpet gave its shrill signal [830] and they joined with one another in battle, how great, do you think, was the roaring din of shields, how great the sound of groans mixed with lamentation? At first the onslaught of the Argive army broke our lines, but then they gave ground. [835] Next, foot was locked with foot and man stood against man as the battle intensified. Many fell. There were two cries of encouragement: 'You who dwell in Athens – You who sow the soil of Argos – will you not ward off disgrace from your city?' [840] With every effort and much toil we finally put the Argive army to flight.

Then old Iolaus, seeing Hyllus going strongly fowards from the mass, stretched out his right hand and begged him to bring him aboard his chariot. [845] Taking the reins in his hands he pressed on after the horses of Eurystheus. What happened after this I could only tell from others' reports, though up to this point I saw it for myself. For as he crossed over the sacred hill of divine Athena, goddess of Pallene, he saw the chariot of Eurystheus [850] and prayed to Hebe and to Zeus that he become young for a single day and exact punishment from his

διssὼ γὰρ ἀστέρ' ἱππικοῖς ἐπὶ ζυγοῖς
σταθέντ' ἔκρυψαν ἅρμα λυγαίῳ νέφει·
σὸν δὴ λέγουσι παῖδά γ' οἱ σοφώτεροι
Ἥβην θ'· ὃ δ' ὄρφνης ἐκ δυσαιθρίου νέων
βραχιόνων ἔδειξεν ἡβητὴν τύπον.
αἱρεῖ δ' ὁ κλεινὸς Ἰόλεως Εὐρυσθέως
τέτρωρον ἅρμα πρὸς πέτραις Σκιρωνίσιν,
δεσμοῖς τε δήσας χεῖρας ἀκροθίνιον
κάλλιστον ἥκει τὸν στρατηλάτην ἄγων
τὸν ὄλβιον πάροιθε. τῇ δὲ νῦν τύχῃ
βροτοῖς ἅπασι λαμπρὰ κηρύσσει μαθεῖν,
τὸν εὐτυχεῖν δοκοῦντα μὴ ζηλοῦν πρὶν ἂν
θανόντ' ἴδῃ τις· ὡς ἐφήμεροι τύχαι.
Χο. ὦ Ζεῦ τροπαῖε, νῦν ἐμοὶ δεινοῦ φόβου
ἐλεύθερον πάρεστιν ἦμαρ εἰσιδεῖν.
Αλ. ὦ Ζεῦ, χρόνῳ μὲν τἄμ' ἐπεσκέψω κακά,
χάριν δ' ὅμως σοι τῶν πεπραγμένων ἔχω·
καὶ παῖδα τὸν ἐμὸν πρόσθεν οὐ δοκοῦσ' ἐγὼ
θεοῖς ὁμιλεῖν νῦν ἐπίσταμαι σαφῶς.
ὦ τέκνα, νῦν δὴ νῦν ἐλεύθεροι πόνων,
ἐλεύθεροι δὲ τοῦ κακῶς ὀλουμένου
Εὐρυσθέως ἔσεσθε καὶ πόλιν πατρὸς
ὄψεσθε, κλήρους δ' ἐμβατεύσετε χθονὸς
καὶ θεοῖς πατρῴοις θύσεθ', ὧν ἀπειργμένοι
ξένοι πλανήτην εἶχετ' ἄθλιον βίον.
ἀτὰρ τί κεύθων Ἰόλεως σοφόν ποτε
Εὐρυσθέως ἐφείσαθ' ὥστε μὴ κτανεῖν;
λέξον· παρ' ἡμῖν μὲν γὰρ οὐ σοφὸν τόδε,
ἐχθροὺς λαβόντα μὴ ἀποτείσασθαι δίκην.
Αγ. τὸ σὸν προτιμῶν, ὡς νιν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἴδοις
†κρατοῦνται καὶ σῇ δεσποτούμενον χερί.
οὐ μὴν ἑκόντα γ' αὐτόν ἀλλὰ πρὸς βίαν
ἔζευξ' ἀνάγκῃ· καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἐβούλετο
ζῶν ἐς σὸν ἐλθεῖν ὄμμα καὶ δοῦναι δίκην.
ἀλλ', ὦ γεραιά, χαῖρε καὶ μέμνησό μοι
ὃ πρῶτον εἶπας ἡνίκ' ἠρχόμην λόγου,

884 παρόντα Collard, κρατοῦσα Reiske, ταρβοῦντα Herwerden, πτήσσοντα Cobet

enemies. Now you may hear of a miracle. For two stars stood above the horses' yoke and hid the chariot in a shadowy cloud. [855] Those more skilled about such things say that it was your son and Hebe. And out of the murky darkness Iolaus showed the youthful mould of his young arms. Glorious Iolaus captured Eurystheus' four-horse chariot at the Scironian rocks, [860] and having bound his hands with cords he comes leading the formerly blessed general as the finest offering from the booty. By his present fate he proclaims a clear lesson for all mortals, that no one should envy the man who seems to enjoy good fortune until [865] he sees that he is dead: our fortunes are short-lived.

CHORUS-LEADER: O Zeus, turner of battle, now I can look upon a day that is freed from terrible fear!

ALCMENE: O Zeus, you finally regarded my sufferings, yet I am grateful to you for what has been done. [870] And though I did not believe before that my son shared the company of the gods, now I know it for certain. Children, now, yes, now you will be free of your troubles, free of the accursed Eurystheus! And you will see your father's city, [875] take possession of his landed estates and sacrifice to your ancestral gods, from whom you were barred while you endured as strangers a miserable life of wandering. But with what clever motive did Iolaus spare Eurystheus from death? [880] Speak. For in my judgement this is no clever thing, not to exact punishment when one has captured one's enemies.

MESSENGER: He did so out of respect for you, so that you might see him with your own eyes, present and subject to your power. It was not willingly, however, but with force [885] that Iolaus yoked him to necessity. For he did not want to come before your eyes alive and pay the penalty. So farewell, old woman, and remember, I pray, what you first said when I began my speech, that you would set me free. For in

ἐλευθερώσειν μ'· ἐν δὲ τοῖς τοιοῖσδε χρὴ
ἀψευδὲς εἶναι τοῖσι γενναίοις στόμα.

Χο. ἐμοὶ χορὸς μὲν ἡδύς, εἰ λίγεια λω- [στρ. α
τοῦ χάρις †ἐνὶ δαῖ†·
ἡδεῖα δ' εὔχαρις Ἀφροδί-
τα· τερπνὸν δέ τι καὶ φίλων
ἆρ' εὐτυχίαν ἰδέσθαι
τῶν πάρος οὐ δοκούντων.
πολλὰ γὰρ τίκτει Μοῖρα τελεσσιδώ-
τειρ' Αἰών τε Χρόνου παῖς.

ἔχεις ὁδόν τιν', ὦ πόλις, δίκαιον· οὐ [ἀντ. α
χρή ποτε τοῦδ' ἀφέσθαι,
τιμᾶν θεούς· ὁ ‹δὲ› μή σε φά-
σκων ἐγγὺς μανιᾶν ἐλαύ-
νει, δεικνυμένων ἐλέγχων
τῶνδ'· ἐπίσημα γάρ τοι
θεὸς παραγγέλλει, τῶν ἀδίκων παραι-
ρῶν φρονήματος αἰεί.

ἔστιν ἐν οὐρανῷ βεβα- [στρ. β
κὼς ὁ σὸς γόνος, ὦ γεραι-
ά· φεύγω λόγον ὡς τὸν Ἅι-
δα δόμον κατέβα, πυρὸς
δεινᾷ φλογὶ σῶμα δαισθείς·
Ἥβας τ' ἐρατὸν χροΐ-
ζει λέχος χρυσέαν κατ' αὐλάν.
ὦ Ὑμέναιε, δισ-
σοὺς παῖδας Διὸς ἠξίωσας.

συμφέρεται τὰ πολλὰ πολ- [ἀντ. β
λοῖς· καὶ γὰρ πατρὶ τῶνδ' Ἀθά-

---

890 ἐλευθερώσειν Porson: ἐλευθέρωσόν L
893 ἐνδέδαεν Diggle, ἐν δ' ἀοιδαί Stinton
903 <δὲ> Triclinius
911 ὁ σὸς Wecklein: θεὸς L
912 φεύγω Elmsley: φεύγει L

such matters [890] the noble should speak without deceit.
The Messenger leaves by Eisodos A.

CHORUS [Strophe]: *For me the dance is sweet, if the clear-sounding charm of the flute has blazed up in it, and sweet is Aphrodite when she is kindly; but it is also delightful* [895] *to see the prosperity of friends who formerly seemed unfortunate. For Fate, giver of completion, and Life, child of Time, bring forth many things.* [900]

[Antistrophe:] *You have a just course, O city; you must never let go of this, of honouring the gods. And any man who claims that you do not drives close to madness, as these proofs reveal.* [905] *For the god passes on a very clear message, always depriving the unjust of their pride.*

[Strophe:] *Your son has entered into heaven,* [910] *old lady. I reject the story that he went down to the house of Hades, his body consumed in the terrible flame of the fire. Rather he lies in Hebe's lovely bed* [915] *in the hall of gold. O Hymenaeus, you honoured two of Zeus' children.*

[Antistrophe:] *Many things agree for many people. For just as they say Athena* [920] *helped these children's father, so too did that*

ναν λέγουσ' ἐπίκουρον εἶ-
ναι, καὶ τούσδε θεᾶς πόλις
καὶ λαὸς ἔσωσε κείνας·
ἔσχεν δ' ὕβριν ἀνδρὸς ᾧ
θυμὸς ἦν πρὸ δίκας βίαιος.
μήποτ' ἐμοὶ φρόνη-
μα φυχά τ' ἀκόρεστος εἴη.

Θε. δέσποιν', ὁρᾷς μέν ἀλλ' ὅμως εἰρήσεται·
Εὐρυσθέα σοι τόνδ' ἄγοντες ἥκομεν,
ἄελπτον ὄψιν τῷδέ τ' οὐχ ἧσσον τύχην·
οὐ γάρ ποτ' ηὔχει χεῖρας ἵξεσθαι σέθεν,
ὅτ' ἐκ Μυκηνῶν πολυπόνῳ σὺν ἀσπίδι
ἔστειχε μείζω τῆς δίκης φρονῶν, πόλιν
πέρσων Ἀθάνας. ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐναντίαν
δαίμων ἔθηκε καὶ μετέστησεν τύχην.
Ὕλλος μὲν οὖν ὅ τ' ἐσθλὸς Ἰόλεως βρέτας
Διὸς τροπαίου καλλίνικον ἵστασαν·
ἐμοὶ δὲ πρὸς σὲ τόνδ' ἐπιστέλλουσ' ἄγειν,
τέρψαι θέλοντες σὴν φρέν'· ἐκ γὰρ εὐτυχοῦς
ἥδιστον ἐχθρὸν ἄνδρα δυστυχοῦνθ' ὁρᾶν.
Αλ. ὦ μῖσος, ἥκεις; εἶλέ σ' ἡ Δίκη χρόνῳ;
πρῶτον μὲν οὖν μοι δεῦρ' ἐπίστρεψον κάρα
καὶ τλῆθι τοὺς σοὺς προσβλέπειν ἐναντίον
ἐχθρούς· κρατῇ γὰρ νῦν γε κοὐ κρατεῖς ἔτι.
ἐκεῖνος εἶ σύ, βούλομαι γὰρ εἰδέναι,
ὃς πολλὰ μὲν τὸν ὄνθ' ὅπου 'στὶ νῦν ἐμὸν
παῖδ' ἀξίωσας, ὦ πανοῦργ', ἐφυβρίσαι
ὕδρας λέοντάς τ' ἐξαπολλύναι λέγων
ἔπεμπες; ἄλλα δ' οἷ' ἐμηχανῶ κακὰ
σιγῶ· μακρὸς γὰρ μῦθος ἂν γένοιτό μοι.
τί γὰρ σὺ κεῖνον οὐκ ἔτλης καθυβρίσαι;
ὃς καὶ παρ' Ἅιδην ζῶντά νιν κατήγαγες.

---

925 βίαιος Musgrave: βιαίως L
928 Θε. Rassow: ἄγγελος L (throughout)
930 τῶιδέ Canter: τῶνδέ L τύχην Wecklein: τυχεῖν L
932 πολυπόνωι σὺν ἀσπίδι Hermann: πολυπόνων σὺν ἀσπίσιν L
950-2 transposed by Wilamowitz

goddess' city and her people save the children. She checked the insolence of the man for whom violent anger took the place of justice. [925] *May my thought and character never be insatiable!*

The Servant returns by Eisodos A with the captive Eurystheus, who is guarded by slaves of Hyllus.

SERVANT: Mistress, you see it yourself, but it will be said all the same: we come bringing you this man, Eurystheus, an unexpected sight, and a fate no less unexpected for him. [930] For he never imagined he would fall into your hands when he set out from Mycenae with his baleful army, his arrogance exceeding justice, to sack Athena's city. But fate reversed his fortune completely. [935] Hyllus and the noble Iolaus were raising a victory image of Zeus, turner of battle, but they ordered me to lead this man to you, wishing to delight you. For it is most pleasing to see one's enemy change from good fortune to bad. [940]

ALCMENE: You hateful creature, have you come? Has Justice caught you at last? First turn your head here towards me and dare to look your enemy in the eye. For now you are ruled and rule no more. Are you the man – for I want to know – [945] who saw fit, you villain, to inflict many outrages upon my son, wherever he now may be, and sent him with orders to destroy hydras and lions? [950] But I say nothing of the other evils you devised, as my story would be too long. For what outrage did you not venture to inflict on him? You even made him go down to Hades alive! Nor did these acts of cruelty satisfy you,

κοὐκ ἤρκεσέν σοι ταῦτα τολμῆσαι μόνον,
ἀλλ' ἐξ ἁπάσης κἀμὲ καὶ τέκν' Ἑλλάδος
ἥλαυνες ἱκέτας δαιμόνων καθημένους,
τοὺς μὲν γέροντας, τοὺς δὲ νηπίους ἔτι.
ἀλλ' ἦλθες ἄνδρας καὶ πόλισμ' ἐλεύθερον,
οἵ σ' οὐκ ἔδεισαν. δεῖ σε κατθανεῖν κακῶς,
καὶ κερδανεῖς ἅπαντα· χρὴν γὰρ οὐχ ἅπαξ
θνῄσκειν σὲ πολλὰ πήματ' ἐξειργασμένον.
Θε. οὐκ ἔστ' ἀνυστὸν τόνδε σοι κατακτανεῖν.
Αλ. ἄλλως ἄρ' αὐτὸν αἰχμάλωτον εἵλομεν.
εἴργει δὲ δὴ τίς τόνδε μὴ θνῄσκειν νόμος;
Θε. τοῖς τῆσδε χώρας προστάταισιν οὐ δοκεῖ.
Αλ. τί δὴ τόδ'; ἐχθροὺς τοισίδ' οὐ καλὸν κτανεῖν;
Θε. οὐχ ὅντιν' ἄν γε ζῶνθ' ἕλωσιν ἐν μάχῃ.
Αλ. καὶ ταῦτα δόξανθ' Ὕλλος ἐξηνέσχετο;
Θε. χρῆν αὐτόν, οἶμαι, τῇδ' ἀπιστῆσαι χθονί.
Αλ. χρῆν τόνδε μὴ ζῆν μηδ' †ὁρᾶν φάος ἔτι†.
Θε. τότ' ἠδικήθη πρῶτον οὐ θανὼν ὅδε.
Αλ. οὔκουν ἔτ' ἐστὶν ἐν καλῷ δοῦναι δίκην;
Θε. οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτον ὅστις ἂν κατακτάνοι.
Αλ. ἔγωγε· καίτοι φημὶ κἄμ' εἶναί τινα.
Θε. πολλὴν ἄρ' ἔξεις μέμψιν, εἰ δράσεις τόδε.
Αλ. φιλῶ πόλιν τήνδ'· οὐδὲν ἀντιλεκτέον.
τοῦτον δ', ἐπείπερ χεῖρας ἦλθεν εἰς ἐμάς,
οὐκ ἔστι θνητῶν ὅστις ἐξαιρήσεται.
πρὸς ταῦτα τὴν θρασεῖαν ὅστις ἂν θέλῃ
καὶ τὴν φρονοῦσαν μεῖζον ἢ γυναῖκα χρὴ
λέξει· τὸ δ' ἔργον τοῦτ' ἐμοὶ πεπράξεται.
Χο. δεινόν τι καὶ συγγνωστόν, ὦ γύναι, σ' ἔχει
νεῖκος πρὸς ἄνδρα τόνδε, γιγνώσκω καλῶς.

961, 964, 966, 968, 970, 972, 974 so assigned by Tyrwhitt: to Chorus by L
962-3, 965, 967, 969, 971 so assigned by Barnes: to Messenger by L
962 punctuated as question in L
969 ἔτ' εἰσορᾶν φάος Erfurdt, ὁρᾶν φάος τόδε Lenting, φῶς ὁρᾶν ἔτι L. Dindorf, ὁρᾶν τὸ φῶς ἔτι Diggle
973 καίτοι φημὶ κἄμ' εἶναί Tyrwhitt: καὶ τί φημι κἂν μεῖναι L

but you drove me and the children from every part of Greece, though we sat as suppliants of the gods, [955] some of us old and others still young children! However, you found men and a city who are free, who did not fear you. You must die vilely, and yet the gain will be all yours. For as you have caused many miseries you should be dying more than once. [960]

SERVANT: It is not possible for you to kill this man.

ALCMENE: Then we took him prisoner to no purpose. But what law in fact prevents this man's death?

SERVANT: It is not approved by the rulers of this land.

ALCMENE: What's this? Do these people not think it right to kill their enemies? [965]

SERVANT: Not those they take alive in battle.

ALCMENE: And did Hyllus tolerate this decision?

SERVANT: He ought, I suppose, to have disobeyed this land.

ALCMENE: This man ought not to be alive or still see the light of day.

SERVANT: He was first wronged when he was not put to death. [970]

ALCMENE: Is it not still right for him to pay the penalty?

SERVANT: There is no one who would kill this man.

ALCMENE: I would; and I say that I am someone.

SERVANT: You will incur much criticism if you do this.

ALCMENE: I love this city; that cannot be denied. [975] But as for this man, since he has fallen into my hands, there is no one alive who will rescue him. Therefore, if anyone wants to call me 'brazen' and 'prouder than a woman should be', he'll say so. But this deed I shall perform! [980]

CHORUS-LEADER: Your quarrel with this man, my lady, is, I know well, a terrible thing and yet understandable.

ΕΥΡΥΣΘΕΥΣ

γύναι, σάφ' ἴσθι μή με θωπεύσοντά σε
μηδ' ἄλλο μηδὲν τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς πέρι
λέξονθ' ὅθεν χρὴ δειλίαν ὀφλεῖν τινα.
ἐγὼ δὲ νεῖκος οὐχ ἑκὼν τόδ' ἠράμην·
ἤδη γε σοὶ μὲν αὐτανέψιος γεγώς,
τῷ σῷ δὲ παιδὶ συγγενὴς Ἡρακλέει.
ἀλλ' εἴτ' ἔχρηζον εἴτε μή-θεὸς γὰρ ἦν-
Ἥρα με κάμνειν τήνδ' ἔθηκε τὴν νόσον.
ἐπεὶ δ' ἐκείνῳ δυσμένειαν ἠράμην
κἄγνων ἀγῶνα τόνδ' ἀγωνιούμενος,
πολλῶν σοφιστὴς πημάτων ἐγιγνόμην
καὶ πόλλ' ἔτικτον νυκτὶ συνθακῶν ἀεί,
ὅπως διώσας καὶ κατακτείνας ἐμοὺς
ἐχθροὺς τὸ λοιπὸν μὴ συνοικοίην φόβῳ,
εἰδὼς μὲν οὐκ ἀριθμὸν ἀλλ' ἐτητύμως
ἄνδρ' ὄντα τὸν σὸν παῖδα· καὶ γὰρ ἐχθρὸς ὢν
ἀκούσεται †γ' ἐσθλὰ† χρηστὸς ὢν ἀνήρ.
κείνου δ' ἀπαλλαχθέντος οὐκ ἐχρῆν μ' ἄρα,
μισούμενον πρὸς τῶνδε καὶ ξυνειδότα
ἔχθραν πατρῴαν, πάντα κινῆσαι πέτρον
κτείνοντα κἀκβάλλοντα καὶ τεχνώμενον;
τοιαῦτα δρῶντι τἄμ' ἐγίγνετ' ἀσφαλῆ.
οὔκουν σύ γ' ἀναλαβοῦσα τὰς ἐμὰς τύχας
ἐχθροῦ λέοντος δυσμενῆ βλαστήματα
ἤλαυνες ἂν κακοῖσιν ἀλλὰ σωφρόνως
εἴασας οἰκεῖν Ἄργος· οὕτιν' ἂν πίθοις.
νῦν οὖν ἐπειδή μ' οὐ διώλεσαν τότε
πρόθυμον ὄντα, τοῖσιν Ἑλλήνων νόμοις
οὐχ ἁγνός εἰμι τῷ κτανόντι κατθανών·
πόλις τ' ἀφῆκε σωφρονοῦσα, τὸν θεὸν
μεῖζον τίουσα τῆς ἐμῆς ἔχθρας πολύ.
προσεῖπας, ἀντήκουσας· ἐντεῦθεν δὲ χρὴ

---

999 γ<οὖν> ἐσθλὰ Headlam, γ' ἔσθλ' <οἶ>α Diggle
1004 τἄμ' ἐγίγνετ' Musgrave: τἀμὰ γίγνετ' L
1006 δυσμενῆ Stephanus: -γενῆ L
1014 προσεῖπας Elmsley: πρὸς ἃ εἶπας L

EURYSTHEUS: Woman, know full well that I shall not flatter you or say anything else to save my life which would incur the charge of cowardice. [985] I did not take this quarrel upon myself willingly. I knew that I was your cousin by birth, and kinsman to your son Heracles. But whether I wanted to or not – for a god was responsible – Hera forced me to suffer this disease. [990] And when I took up hostilities against that man and realized that this struggle would be mine to fight, I became a deviser of many sufferings, and, sitting through the night, I worked out many ways to scatter and kill my enemies [995] so that I might not live in fear for the rest of my life, as I knew your son was not a mere cipher but truly a man. For although he was my enemy, he will hear such noble things as befit a good man.

But once he was dead, was it then not right that, [1000] since I was hated by these children and aware of their inherited enmity, I leave no stone unturned as I exiled, plotted, and tried to kill them? If I did this, my position was likely to become secure. I suppose that if you had taken over my fortunes [1005] you would not have persecuted the enemy lion's hostile offspring, but would have tolerantly allowed them to live in Argos. Nobody would believe you.

Now, therefore, since they did not kill me then, although I was eager to die, by the laws of Greece [1010] my death brings pollution upon my killer. The city spared me and showed restrainst, honouring the gods far more than its enmity towards me. You have spoken, you have heard my response. From now on I must be called the man

τὸν προστρόπαιον †τόν τε γενναῖον† καλεῖν. 1015
οὕτω γε μέντοι τἄμ' ἔχει· θανεῖν μὲν οὐ
χρῄζω, λιπὼν δ' ἂν οὐδὲν ἀχθοίμην βίον.
Χο. παραινέσαι σοι σμικρόν, Ἀλκμήνη, θέλω,
τὸν ἄνδρ' ἀφεῖναι τόνδ', ἐπεὶ δοκεῖ πόλει.
Αλ. τί δ' ἦν θάνῃ τε καὶ πόλει πιθώμεθα; 1020
Χο. τὰ λῷστ' ἂν εἴη· πῶς τάδ' οὖν γενήσεται;
Αλ. ἐγὼ διδάξω ῥᾳδίως· κτανοῦσα γὰρ
τόνδ' εἶτα νεκρὸν τοῖς μετελθοῦσιν φίλων
δώσω· τὸ γὰρ σῶμ' οὐκ ἀπιστήσω χθονί,
οὗτος δὲ δώσει τὴν δίκην θανὼν ἐμοί. 1025
Ευ. κτεῖν', οὐ παραιτοῦμαί σε· τήνδε δὲ πτόλιν,
ἐπεί μ' ἀφῆκε καὶ κατῃδέσθη κτανεῖν,
χρησμῷ παλαιῷ Λοξίου δωρήσομαι,
ὃς ὠφελήσει μείζον' ἢ δοκεῖ χρόνῳ.
θανόντα γάρ με θάψεθ' οὗ τὸ μόρσιμον, 1030
δίας πάροιθε παρθένου Παλληνίδος·
καὶ σοὶ μὲν εὔνους καὶ πόλει σωτήριος
μέτοικος αἰεὶ κείσομαι κατὰ χθονός,
τοῖς τῶνδε δ' ἐκγόνοισι πολεμιώτατος,
ὅταν μόλωσι δεῦρο σὺν πολλῇ χερὶ 1035
χάριν προδόντες τήνδε· τοιούτων ξένων
προύστητε. πῶς οὖν ταῦτ' ἐγὼ πεπυσμένος
δεῦρ' ἦλθον ἀλλ' οὐ χρησμὸν ἡζόμην θεοῦ;
Ἥραν νομίζων θεσφάτων κρείσσω πολὺ
κοὐκ ἂν προδοῦναί μ'. ἀλλὰ μήτε μοι χοὰς 1040
μήθ' αἷμ' ἐάσητ' εἰς ἐμὸν στάξαι τάφον.
κακὸν γὰρ αὐτοῖς νόστον ἀντὶ τῶνδ' ἐγὼ
δώσω· διπλοῦν δὲ κέρδος ἕξετ' ἐξ ἐμοῦ·
ὑμᾶς τ' ὀνήσω τούσδε τε βλάψω θανών.
Αλ. τί δῆτα μέλλετ', εἰ πόλει σωτηρίαν 1045
κατεργάσασθαι τοῖσί τ' ἐξ ὑμῶν χρεών,
κτείνειν τὸν ἄνδρα τόνδ', ἀκούοντες τάδε;

1015 τὸν παλαμναῖον Kirchhoff
1030 θάψαθ' Dobree
1039 νομίζων Barnes: -ζω L
1041 ἐάσητ' Reiske: ἐάσης L

whose blood calls for vengeance and the noble-minded one. [1015] Yet this at least is how things stand with me: I do not want to die, but I would not be at all aggrieved to leave life.

CHORUS-LEADER: I wish to offer you a little advice, Alcmene: release this man since the city deems it right.

ALCMENE: What if he were to die and I were also to obey the city? [1020]

CHORUS-LEADER: That would be best. How then can this come about?

ALCMENE: I will easily explain. For I will kill this man and then give his corpse to those of his friends who come for him. So as regards his body, I will not be disobeying the city, but he will pay the penalty to me by his death. [1025]

EURYSTHEUS: Kill on, I do not ask you for mercy. But as for this city, since it spared me and forbore to kill me, I shall present it with an ancient oracle of Loxias, which will in time be of greater benefit than it seems. For when I am dead you will bury me where it is fated, [1030] before the shrine of the holy maiden, Athena Pallenis. And I shall lie forever beneath the earth, a foreign resident who is well disposed to you and a saviour to the city, but most hostile to the descendants of these children when they betray this favour of yours and come here with a powerful army. [1035] Such are the guests you have defended. Why then, when I knew these things, did I come here instead of heeding the god's oracle? I thought that Hera was far stronger than any oracle and would not betray me. But do not allow libations [1040] or blood to drip on to my tomb. In return for this I will give them a disastrous return here. Your gain from me will be twofold: by dying I will benefit you and damage them.

ALCMENE [*To the Chorus*]: Why then, hearing these words, do you delay to kill this man, if it is fated to win salvation for your city [1045] and your descendants? For he indicates the safest course: the man is an

δείκνυσι γὰρ κέλευθον ἀσφαλεστάτην·
ἐχθρὸς μὲν ἀνήρ, ὠφελεῖ δὲ κατθανών.
κομίζετ' αὐτόν, δμῶες, εἶτα χρὴ κυσὶν
δοῦναι κτανόντας· μὴ γὰρ ἐλπίσῃς ὅπως
αὖθις πατρῴας ζῶν ἔμ' ἐκβαλεῖς χθονός.
‹ ›
‹ ›
‹ ›
Χο. ταῦτα δοκεῖ μοι. στείχετ', ὀπαδοί.
τὰ γὰρ ἐξ ἡμῶν
καθαρῶς ἔσται βασιλεῦσιν.

1052 lacuna indicated by Hermann
1053-5 suspected by Barrett

enemy, and his death brings benefit. [*To the slaves guarding Eurystheus*] Take him away, servants, then you must kill him and give him to the dogs. [1050] [*To Eurystheus, as he is led away*] For do not hope that you will live to expel me again from my native land!

CHORUS: This seems right to me. On your way, servants. For our actions will be free from pollution to our rulers.

Eurystheus and the servants depart by Eisodos A, the Chorus by Eisodos B; Alcmene returns to the temple of Zeus, accompanied by the children of Heracles.

FRAGMENTA HERACLIDIS FALSO ADSCRIPTA

1. [fr. 852 N]

ὅστις δὲ τοὺς τεκόντας ἐν βίωι σέβει,
ὅδ' ἐστὶ καὶ ζῶν καὶ θανὼν θεοῖς φίλος.
ὅστις δὲ †τοὺς φύσαντας† μὴ τιμᾶν θέλῃ,
μή μοι γένοιτο μήτε συνθύτης θεοῖς
μήτ' ἐν θαλάσσηι κοινόπλουν στέλλοι σκάφος.

2. [fr. 853 N]

τρεῖς εἰσὶν ἀρεταὶ τὰς χρεών σ' ἀσκεῖν, τέκνον·
θεούς τε τιμᾶν τούς τε θρέψαντας γονῆς
νόμους τε κοινοὺς Ἑλλάδος· καὶ ταῦτα δρῶν
κάλλιστον ἕξεις στέφανον εὐκλείας ἀεί.

3. [fr. 854 N]

τὸ μὲν σφαγῆναι δεινόν, εὔκλειαν δ' ἔχει·
τὸ μὴ θανεῖν δ' οὐ δεινόν, ἡδονὴ δ' ἔνι.

4. [fr. 851 N]

τάραττε καὶ χόρδευ' ὁμοῦ τὰ πράγματα.

5. [fr. 949 N]

καὶ τοῖς τεκοῦσιν ἀξίαν τιμὴν νέμειν.

Fragments falsely ascribed to *Heraclidae*

1. [fr. 852 N]
Whoever honours his parents when they are alive
is dear to the gods both in life and in death.
Whoever does not wish to honour †those who bore him†,
may he not join me either in sacrifice to the gods
or in putting a shared ship to sea.

2. [fr. 853 N]
There are three virtues which you must practise, child:
to honour the gods, those who gave you birth,
and the common laws of Greece. By doing this
you will have forever the fairest crown of fame.

3. [fr. 854 N]
To suffer death as a sacrificial victim is terrible, but brings fame.
To escape death is not terrible and there is pleasure in it.

4. [fr. 851 N]
Stir and hash all their affairs together.

5. [fr. 949 N]
And to pay fitting honour to their parents.

Commentary

Hypothesis to the *Heraclidae*:

The dramatic hypotheses ('prefaces' or 'plot summaries') which are preserved in the surviving medieval manuscripts and ancient papyri fall into three general categories (see Zuntz 129-52). The first and most valuable are those derived from the Alexandrian edition of Aristophanes of Byzantium (cf. Intro. §8). Although only fragments of these survive (occasionally combined with the two other types of hypothesis), most of the surviving plays have them and some are more or less complete. We thus have enough material to be able to piece together the scope and typical features of Aristophanes' introductory notes (for Eur., cf. *Alc.*, *Med.*, *Hipp.*, *Andr.*, *Hec.*, *Phoen.*, *Or.*, *Bacch.*, *Rhesus*). They combine basic points of scenography (e.g. where the play is set, the identity of the Chorus and prologue speaker) with more scholarly information regarding such topics as the treatment of the myth by the other two tragedians, the date of the play, the titles of companion plays, and the results of the contest (*Alc.* second prize, *Med.* third prize, *Hipp.* first prize, *Phoen.* second prize). The second category of hypothesis comprises 'the elaborations of Byzantine grammarians' (Zuntz 131), summaries of the plays which were intended for use in schools.

By contrast, the third type of hypothesis is uniquely Euripidean, and in the case of the *Hcld.* it is only this kind that survives. Hypotheses of this narrative form 'stem ultimately from a Euripidean collection composed in the 1st or 2nd Century A.D. but ascribed in order to acquire respectability to Aristotle's 4th Century B.C. pupil Dicaearchus' (*Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays. Vol. I* (1995) 2 n. 1). They were written 'for the benefit of those whose interest was in the plots rather than the plays' (P. T. Stevens (ed.), *Euripides: Andromache* (Oxford, 1971) 26). The *Hcld.* hypothesis is a fairly typical example of its kind, being a straightforward summary of the plot, but one marked by gaps and inaccuracies. Inaccuracies include the Hcld.'s journey **to Athens** (rather than Marathon, line 4) and the sacrifice **to Demeter** (actually to Kore, line 9); for other minor slips, cf. Zuntz (1947) 48-9 and O'Connor-Visser (1987) 35-9. As is also typical of such 'Tales from Euripides', anonymous figures in the play are identified, so that **Kopreus** (line 6) and **Macaria** (line 13) are named: cf. Intro. §1(f) and (g). As O'Connor-Visser (1987) 39 says, 'the hypothesis was written for the sake of the myth, not for the tragedy', and its main purpose was to sum up the plot for ancient students of the text.

However, on the basis of the phrase **they honoured her noble death** (line 14), Wilamowitz (1882b) 344 argued that the writer of the hypothesis had access to Eur.'s 'original' text. In other words, since he believed that we possess merely an abridged version of the play (cf. Intro §2(a)), Wilamowitz thought that the phrase supported the theory of a missing Messenger-scene containing a report of the daughter's death and burial. Yet as Wilkins (p. 45) observes, 'The statement ['they honoured her noble death'] may refer to no more than the stanza 619-29. If greater honours are indicated, then the writer of the hypothesis knew either of an alternative version of the play, or, more likely, in view of the naming of Macaria in particular, he drew on material extraneous to the play.' So the hypothesis' vague reference to honours is not particularly solid evidence for the supposed missing scene.

Dramatis personae: the characters in order of appearance (Kopreus and Macaria are named, Acamas is omitted). The date and authorship of such cast lists are unknown, but they may go back to Aristophanes.

1-72 Opening scene (*Prologos*): Iolaus, Herald.

The play opens with Iolaus and the male children (cf. 41-3n.) of Heracles already in place at the altar of Zeus Agoraios (70n.) after a so-called 'cancelled entry'; that is, the actors enter and take up their positions on stage before the play begins: see Taplin (1977) 134-6, Rehm (1988) 274 n. 50, 302. Eur. seems to have liked the atmosphere and tension created by an opening suppliant scene (cf. Soph. *OT*). This is the earliest surviving example, and similar 'suppliant tableaux' are found at the beginning of *Andr.*, *Suppl.*, *Her.*, and *Hel.* (In *Suppl.* the Chorus is also present; for this unique addition, cf. Rehm (1988) 274). By contrast, in Aesch. (*Suppl.*, *Eum.*) and Soph. (*OC*) we are shown the arrival of the suppliants at the sacred place.

Iol. delivers the prologue speech, identifying himself, telling us where the action is set and giving us the story so far: Heracles' death, his family's flight from Argos, and their eventual arrival at Marathon. Such expository speeches are found in almost all of Eur.'s surviving plays: the exceptions are the (probably pseudo-Euripidean) *Rhesus*, which has a dialogue between the chorus and Hector, and the (possibly pseudo-Euripidean) opening scene of *Iphigenia at Aulis*, where the 'conventional' iambic trimeter speech of Agamemnon (49-114) is preceded by an anapaestic dialogue with an old retainer (1-48). By contrast with both Eur. and Aesch., Soph. prefers a dialogue opening to his plays: see M. Griffith (ed.), *Sophocles: Antigone* (Cambridge, 1999) 119.

The expository style was so characteristic of Eur.'s prologues that Aristophanes chose to mock it in his *Frogs* (1197-1247), suggesting that it was formulaic and boring. Another ancient critic praises Eur.'s lyrics but accuses him of being 'annoying in his prologues' (*Origins and Life of Euripides* §37, a work found in some Euripidean manuscripts). Grube (1941) 166-7 regards Iol.'s speech itself as 'clumsy ... neither attractive nor happily phrased ... He begins with a general statement, as stilted as it is cynical ... the whole speech ... seems to be lacking in dignity.' However, as in other suppliant prologues, an atmosphere of danger, misery, and constraint is effectively built up here by the speaker's words. Our sympathies are immediately engaged for the threatened family of Heracles: Iol.'s speech thus prepares us for the arrival of the Herald (48ff), and for his violence towards suppliants on sacred ground (67n.).

1-11 Iol. begins with a moral contrast between the just and the selfish man (1-5), which he illustrates from his own experience and to his own credit (5-11). To open with a *sententia* is unusual enough to be striking (cf. Soph. *Trach.*, Eur. *Sthen.*, *Or.*). It is the first of many generalizations which show Iol.'s strong sense of right and wrong (cf. 200-1, 302-3, 327-8, 387-8, 458-60, 745-7). But it is also relevant to the plight of the Heraclidae, whose protection depends on Iol.'s sense of honour (cf. 6n.) as well as on that of the Chorus (101-4) and Demophon (236-46). H. D. F. Kitto, *Greek Tragedy* (London, 1961^3) 253-4 overlooks the dramatic context when he says 'Euripides is not above suggesting that he [Iol.] is a prosy old man (unless, which God forbid, we suppose that the stream of platitudes with which he begins was intended by Euripides to be a contribution to moral philosophy).' Eur. often includes genealogies in his prologues (e.g. *Her.*, *Ion*, *IT*, *Phoen.*, *Or.*, *Archelaus*), but here the

genealogy is reserved for later, for expressly emotive and dramaturgical reasons, as the climactic and clinching ground of Iol.'s appeal to Dem. (207-13n.).

1 **Long ago now:** the opening phrase suggests both Iol.'s age, which is emphasized throughout (e.g. 39, 75, 127-9), and the 'timelessness' of his opinion.

2 **just to his neighbours:** an ancient Greek's obligations were (in roughly descending order of importance) to his children, wife, parents, relatives, friends, and fellow-citizens. Iol. focuses here on the last since he is making a point about the good (and bad) man's effect on his whole community.

3 **given up to gain:** as Stevens points out (comm. on *Andr.* 727-8), ἀνειμένος (the perf. pass. part. of ἀνίημι) 'when applied to persons is always used in a bad sense, of those who do not show suitable restraint'; cf. *Ant.* 578-9, where Creon uses it of Antigone and Ismene's 'loose' behaviour.

4 **useless to his city:** it is typical of Athenian democratic thought for an individual to be evaluated in terms of his 'usefulness' to the polis: cf. Dover (1974) 296-9. Perhaps the most famous modern parallel is President J. F. Kennedy's 'Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.' According to Pericles (in the Funeral Speech), the Athenians consider 'useless' (ἀχρεῖον) the citizen who takes no interest in public affairs (Thuc. 2.40.2). **hard to have dealings with:** βαρύς suggests both 'difficult' and 'dangerous' for others.

5 **best to himself:** the mid-line pause stresses Iol.'s final criticism of the selfish man. **from experience:** lit. 'I know, having learnt [it] not [merely] by hearsay'. The traditional idea of knowledge at the price of suffering (e.g. *Ag.* 177, 250-1) colours Iol.'s 'experience'.

6-11: Iol.'s support for Heracles and his children proves that he is a δίκαιος ἀνήρ ('just man', 2) himself.

6 **out of honour:** the dative is causal: Smyth §1517. Iol.'s honour (αἰδώς) is linked here to his respect for **kinship**, since it prevents him from neglecting his kinsman Heracles: cf. Cairns (1993) 273 n. 30. Iol.'s father, Iphicles, was half-brother of Heracles and son of Alcmene by Amphitryon (contrast Heracles' divine parentage). Thus Iol. is Heracles' nephew and is usually portrayed as his younger assistant. Here, however, Euripides has emphasized Iol.'s old age (making him contemporary with Heracles' mother), both to stress the vulnerability of the Hcld. and to prepare for Iol.'s miraculous rejuvenation (849-58).

7 **I could have lived:** for the accusative absolute use of impersonal verbs (ἐξόν, lit. 'it being possible'), see Smyth §2076, Goodwin §851. **quietly:** i.e. like the selfish man of 3-5. The context brings out the pejorative connotations of such 'quietness' or inactivity (ἀπραγμοσύνη) that are found in fifth-century political thought: cf. 4n., Dover (1974) 188-9, L. B. Carter, *The Quiet Athenian* (Oxford, 1985).

8 **shared in Heracles' many labours:** Heracles performed twelve labours for Eurystheus, six in the Peloponnese and six at the edges of the inhabited world. For their portrayal in archaic and classical art, see T. H. Carpenter, *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece* (London, 1991) 117-34. At 215ff. Iol. proudly claims to have helped Heracles fetch the girdle of the Amazon queen. Later, in a spirit of nostalgia, he recalls Heracles' sack of Sparta, which was one of the so-called *parerga* or incidental labours (741-2).

9-10 **since he dwells in heaven:** by contrast with Alc. (871-2n.), Iol. confidently asserts Heracles' deification (cf. 910-18).

10 beneath my wing: a common tragic metaphor for the protection of children: cf. *Her.* 71-2, 224 (also in supplication), *Andr.* 441, 504-5, *Tro.* 751. At *Eum.* 1001 the Erinyes describe the Athenians themselves as the nestlings of Athena.

11 these children: Iol. points to the suppliants grouped around him at the altar. Unlike Heracles' daughter (474ff.), these children never speak but they are often referred to by the adults (using the deictic pronoun) as they argue over their fate (e.g. 64, 66, 123, 137, 140).

12ff: γὰρ introduces the narrative section of the prologue (12-47): Iol. explains how they ended up as suppliants at Marathon (32) after the death of Heracles.

13 first decided to kill us: Eury.'s immediate reaction is to eliminate the children of his former enemy, a policy which he later presents as rational, using the cruel logic of archaic revenge (cf. 1005-8n.). Such thinking could lead to an endless cycle of tit-for-tat murders, whose replacement by an impartial legal system had been dramatized in Aesch.'s *Oresteia* of 458. In *Hcld.*, by contrast, Alcmene overrides Athenian law and insists on the traditional prerogatives of revenge (879-82, 958-60).

14-16: Iol. and the Hcld. may have escaped from Argos with their lives, but to lose one's polis and live in exile was a major deprivation in Greek eyes (and a standard punishment for convicted homicides). Nonetheless, it is not enough for Eury.

16 as people drive us beyond their borders: Since it is the Hcld. who are being expelled, Diggle 220-1 has proposed 'the genitive absolute [ἐξοριζόντων], with its indefinite subject ["people"] unexpressed.' The manuscript reading ἐξορίζοντες is problematic, as this verb usually has the transitive meaning 'to banish', 'to send beyond the borders' (cf. 257, *Tro.* 1106), and not (intransitive) 'to cross the borders'.

17-18 to inflict this outrage: the repetition (*figura etymologica*) in ὕβρισμα ὑβρίσαι sharpens the criticism of Eury. Eur. is fond of this phrase: cf. *Her.* 704, 741, *Suppl.* 512, *Hel.* 785, *Bacch.* 247, 1297, *IA* 961. N. R. E. Fisher, *Hybris: A Study in the Values of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greece* (Warminster, 1992) 425 remarks 'Not surprisingly ... the play's uses of the term [*hybris*] focus on Eurystheus' offences.' For the wide range of acts classifiable as *hybris*, see the excellent discussion by D. M. MacDowell (ed.), *Demosthenes: Against Meidias* (Oxford, 1990) 18-23. He observes that (p. 19) 'its essence consists of having energy or power and misusing it self-indulgently', which certainly applies to Eury.'s behaviour, despite his later attempts to excuse it (cf. 989-90, 1005-8nn.).

19-22 Eury.'s past technique of threatening other states prepares us for the Herald's imminent entrance (48ff.).

20 demanded our surrender: ἐξαιτέω is used to demand the return of a criminal (LSJ *s.v.*): Iol. represents the language of Eury.'s agents, while the historic present (for imperfect) makes Eury.'s past actions more vivid.

26-7 word-order and the use of these verbs and their συν-compounds in successive lines have a pathetic effect and stress Iol.'s decision to join the Hcld. in their suffering.

28 ashamed ... lest someone should say: Iol. is motivated by a typically heroic fear of what others will say (so too is Heracles' daughter: 516-19). The phrase 'lest someone should say' is Homeric in resonance (e.g. *Il.* 23.575), as is the quotation of an anonymous onlooker (29-30), which reinforces the feeling of heroic shame.

32 **Marathon and its neighbouring land:** According to Athenian tradition, Theseus unified the communities of Attica under Athenian leadership in the Mycenaean period (cf. Thuc. 2.15.2). But although this ended the political autonomy of places like Eleusis and Marathon, they maintained a certain degree of independence as centres of religious cult. 'Marathon and its neighbouring land' refers to the Marathonian Tetrapolis, a cluster of four originally independent villages which functioned as a cult-organization throughout the classical period (cf. 80-1n.). The action is set at Marathon because of its mythical and religious links to the Hcld., but Marathon and Athens cannot be distinguished from each other: the distance between them is blurred in the play (cf. 37-8, 69, Intro. §5). Athens' political control over Marathon in the fifth century must also have linked the two communities together in the minds of the Athenian audience. The four surviving Greek tragedies which are set in Attica (*Eum.* 235ff., *Hcld.*, *Suppl.*, *OC*) all concern Athens' defence of foreign suppliants, suggesting that this was an important part of the Athenians' self-perception (cf. Intro. §3). Moreover, three of these plays are set in the Attic countryside, at Marathon (*Hcld.*), Eleusis (*Suppl.*), and Colonus (*OC*): the political and religious boundaries between the polis of Athens and the rest of Attica are fluid.

33 **supplicating the gods:** θεῶν is governed by ἱκέται rather than βώμιοι (which is an adjective of place; cf. 196). Contrast Kovacs (Loeb) 'sitting at the altars of the gods supplicating for help.'

34-5 **the two sons of Theseus rule the plains of this land:** the land is Attica, which Demophon and Acamas rule from their palace near Marathon (340-3). Their successful sharing of power is a positive Athenian counterpart to the brothers Eteocles and Polynices' disastrous conduct at Thebes (cf. e.g. *Phoen.* 74-6).

36 **when lots were cast:** Wilkins (on 34-7) points to the use of the lot in Homer and says 'There is no necessary reference here to the Athenian democracy.' But it is part of the play's positive presentation of Athens that it is governed along democratic lines (Griffith (Intro. n. 50) 23-4 discusses the Athenians' self-image as democratic and freedom-loving). In *Suppl.* Theseus is presented even more explicitly than Dem. as Athens' 'democratic' king (esp. 404-8, 438-41). Like Pelasgus in Aesch.'s *Suppl.* (365-9), Theseus seeks the people's approval before taking action to help the suppliants (349-55). Commenting on Aesch.'s play, M. Ostwald, *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law* (Berkeley, 1986) 142 remarks that the presence of Pelasgus 'is far from impairing the democratic process at the core of the play. Rather, Pelasgus glorifies democracy'. By contrast with Pelasgus and Theseus, Dem. does not consult the Athenian people before taking the Hcld.'s side (236ff.), but the Chorus (as average citizens) have by then made clear their view of the Herald's actions (127-9), and Dem. is shown to be sensitive to popular feeling when the crisis of human sacrifice threatens the people directly (cf. 415-24). Tragedy's royal stories cannot become charter myths for absolute monarchy when the Athenian democratic constitution is retrojected and at the same time validated in such plays (cf. the endorsement of Athenian judicial procedure in *Eum.*). As is typical of tragedy, heroic monarchy and fifth-century democracy interact in the *Hcld.*, encouraging the audience to identify Dem.'s city with their own. This increases their involvement with the action and sharpens the force of the drama's disturbing close. **among the descendants of Pandion:** Officials in Athens were elected by lot from a pre-selected list; here qualification for the list is descent from Pandion,

king of Athens (his name was given to one of the ten tribes created by Cleisthenes in 508/7). Pandion's son, Aegeus, was father of Theseus.

37 **they are related to these children:** Dem. and Acamas were related to the Hcld. through Theseus' mother, Aethra: see 207-12n.

37-8 **on this journey:** internal Acc. (ὁδόν). **to the land of glorious Athens:** Acc. of 'motion to' (τέρμονας). 'land' for τέρμονας is preferable to 'borders' (Loeb); as Barrett notes (on *Hipp.* 1158-9), 'Words meaning "boundaries" (ὅροι, ὁρίσματα, τέρμονες) are commonly used with the gen. of a country in contexts of leaving or entering', and in this context they often refer simply to the place rather than its borders.

40 **I am darkly troubled:** καλχαίνω (an unusual and forceful word) derives from κάλχη ('purple murex'), which was used as a dye. Worry 'darkens' the mind; as Griffith (1-72n.) notes on *Ant.* 20, the image is found in Greek medical writers as well as in poetry.

41-4 Iol. feels shame at the thought of Heracles' daughters being seen in public. Here, as often in tragedy, a fifth-century convention (governing the behaviour of young women) is retrojected into the world of heroic myth (cf. 474-7, *Phoen.* 93-5, 1275-6, *Or.* 108; for the idea applied to married women, cf. *Andr.* 876-8, *El.* 343-4, *IA* 825-34).

45-7 Hyllus was the eldest son of Heracles and Deianeira (cf. *Trach.*). He and his brothers are said here to be looking for an alternative refuge, but return later with a large allied army (664ff.). Hyllus never appears on stage himself, though we might expect him to (e.g. at 928): cf. A. N. Michelini, *Euripides and The Tragic Tradition* (Wisconsin, 1987) 247 '*Andromache* and *Herakleidai* are plays notable for their omission of the heroic male: Hyllos and Neoptolemos, although important to the plots, take no part in the dramatic action.' Eur. focuses instead on the less familiar members of Heracles' family: Iol., Alcmene, and Heracles' anonymous daughter. Hyllus' absence concentrates attention on the unexpected heroism of his sister and the rejuvenated Iol.

49 **I see the herald of Eurystheus:** Iol. immediately recognizes Eury.'s henchman from previous encounters in other cities (19-20). The Herald carries a staff as a symbol of his office, which can also be brandished threateningly at Iol. (cf. 63; Intro. §6).

52-4 One would expect the entering character to begin the dialogue but here Iol.'s anger prompts him to address the Herald first ('you hateful creature'): cf. Mastronarde (1979) 22 with n. 16.

54 lit. 'that same (ταὐτοῦ) mouth of yours'.

55ff. In only two of Eur.'s tragedies is the prologue speech followed immediately by the entrance song of the chorus (*Suppl.*, *Bacch.*; cf. *Cycl.*). Here, as in (e.g.) *Alc.*, *Med.*, and *Andr.*, the opening speech is followed by dialogue. As in *Alc.* (Apollo and Thanatos), the newcomer is hostile and the dialogue heated. The Herald of Eury. is not named in the play, but the audience will have known him as Kopreus: cf. Intro. §1(g). Significantly, the Herald in the *Hcld.* arrives before the suppliants' protector (contrast Aesch. and Eur. *Suppl.*). Such a sequence of events increases the threat of violence and allows the Herald a chance to remove the suppliants before they can even make their case to the Athenians.

55 **You no doubt believe:** που (LSJ *s.v.* 'perhaps, I suppose') is used to qualify an expression, here ironically.

56 **what foolish thinking:** 'To the Greeks folly seemed to combine moral with intellectual obliquity' (Pearson). The Herald stakes his claim early, implying that Iol. and the Hcld. are wrong (both morally and intellectually) to think that Athens will protect them.

57-8 your useless strength: the Herald betrays the true thrust of his 'argument': Argos' military power (cf. 153-61).

60 the penalty of stoning: 'the traditional form of communal execution of an abominated criminal, where everyone and no one takes responsibility for the killing' (West on *Or.* 50). It is a mark of Eury.'s brutality that he plans to inflict on the innocent Hcld. such an extreme punishment (which was used in cases of sacrilege or blood-pollution: cf. *Ion* 1237, *Bacch.* 356, Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1616).

63ff. Physical violence between the actors on stage is rare in surviving tragedy (but common in Old Comedy). In Aesch. *Suppl.* 836ff. the Herald of Aegyptus threatens to drag off the Danaid suppliants but is stopped by the entrance of Pelasgus. Here the Herald actually seizes the children (65; cf. Creon in *OC* 818ff.) and knocks Iol. to the ground (67). Such unusual violence is all the more shocking here since it is directed against suppliants on holy ground, and in circumstances which make the Herald's actions both illegal and sacrilegious. The importance attached to *contact* with sacred ground in times of crisis (and not only in supplication) is well illustrated by Hdt. 1.26, where the people of Ephesus, under siege from Croesus, run a mile-long rope from their walls to the temple of Artemis, intending to ensure by this contact the goddess' defence of their city.

65 You'll see: lit. 'you will know'; for the implied threat, cf. 269 ('I will know'). **You are not:** the use of the imperfect is colloquial: cf. Stevens (1976) 62 on 'The imperfect used to describe the sudden realisation that something has been, and still is true. In this idiom the verb is nearly always the imperfect of εἰμί, and is generally accompanied by ἄρα.' Cf. also *GP* 36, 45. **it seems:** with ἄρα the Herald points to his own act of grabbing the children, which, he claims, shows Iol. to be a poor prophet.

67-8 Get out of here: the word occurs at *Her.* 260 (the Chorus-leader addressing Lycus) but otherwise only in comedy. Its vulgar tone suits the abusive behaviour of the Herald; cf. Stevens (1976) 13, *Her.* 1290. **considering them Eurystheus' property:** νομίζω is used to express possession ('I consider [x to be the property of y]') with the owner in the genitive: LSJ *s.v.* II.7.

69-72 Iol. invokes the aid of the Athenians (the appeal to the whole city or people is typical of tragedy: cf. West on *Or.* 1296). The cry for help or for witnesses to a crime is a widespread feature of small communities, both ancient and modern; cf. Friis Johansen-Whittle on Aesch. *Suppl.* 905 'Unless an act of violence met with immediate audible protest in the form of a call for succour ..., the wronged party had no legal case for redress.' While not limited to suppliant plays, the call for help (or *boê*) is well suited to the situation of suppliants under attack: cf. Taplin (1977) 218-21, who also notes that (p. 219) 'In drama the *boê* makes for an exciting rise in tension (and in the volume of sound), and it provides a convincing and integral entry motivation.' Iol.'s cry motivates two entries: the Chorus respond immediately (72 βοή), closely followed by Demophon and Acamas (121 βοηδρομήσας).

69 You who dwell in Athens from olden times: it was a proud Athenian boast that they had always lived in Attica as descendants of the autochthonous Erechtheus/Erichthonius, who was worshipped along with Athena Polias on the Acropolis: cf. *Il.* 2.546-51, *Od.* 7.80-1, Eur. *Erechth.* fr. 370.90-4 K, N. Loraux, *The Children of Athena*, trans. C. Levine (Princeton, 1993) chs. 1 and 5. This was felt to make them more settled and homogeneous than other poleis, and therefore superior to

non-authochthonous communities such as the migrating Dorians (cf. Intro. §1(a)). In context here it is 'an appeal by the helpless fugitives to those who have never been forcibly dispossessed' (Pearson), and as such it is calculated to win maximum sympathy (from the audience as well as from the Chorus). **from olden times:** the epic and archaic expression (δαρὸν χρόνον e.g. *Il.* 14.206) adds solemnity; cf. Aesch. *Suppl.*, *IA* 680.

70 **Zeus Agoraios:** for the significance of the epithet 'of the Agora', see Intro. §5. The play does not explicitly locate Zeus' altar and temple in the Agora of Marathon (as Wilkins observes), but the fact that the Athenian altar of Zeus Agoraios was found in the Agora (as in many other cities; cf. *RE* X A (1972) 256-8) makes it likely that the audience imagined this one to be in the Agora of Marathon as well. In any case, the precise site of the altar is unimportant, though it is close (in imaginary space) to Demophon's palace (340-3n.).

71 **our suppliant branches defiled:** these emblems (cf. *Cho.* 1035, *Eum.* 43-5) were supposed to be removed only when the suppliant's request had been granted: Aesch. *Suppl.* 506-7, Soph. *OT* 143, Eur. *Suppl.* 32, 359-60.

72 **disgrace ... dishonour:** the Greek nouns are accusative in apposition to the sentence and signify the result of the Herald's violence.

73-117: Entrance Song (*Parodos*) of the Chorus.

The Chorus of fifteen old men of Marathon arrive from the side-entrance (*eisodos*) on the right (cf. Intro. §5), led by an *aulos*-player; cf. M. L. West, *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford, 1992) 81 'The musical aulos was a pipe with finger-holes and a reed mouthpiece. The player ... played two of them at once, one with each hand.' The Chorus have come in response to Iolaus' cry for help (73-4). In several plays of Eur. and Soph. the parodos is shared by actor(s) and chorus (*Med.*, *El.*, *Tro.*, *IT*, *Ion*, *Hel.*, *Or.*; Soph. *El.*, *Phil.*, *OC*). Here the Chorus engage with both Iol. and the Herald. The Chorus' dochmiacs and lyric iambics are answered by the actors' spoken iambic trimeters. There is some controversy surrounding the precise form and arrangement of the lyric part of the parodos-scene (see 75-110n.). Nevertheless, it is striking how relatively little song there is in the play: 161 lines = 13.6%, the lowest percentage of any tragedy; for a table showing the percentages of lines sung in all the plays, cf. E. Csapo, 'Later Euripidean Music', *ICS* 24-25 (1999-2000) 399-426, p. 410. Some Euripidean plays lack monody (solo actor's song) but contain lyric exchange between actors and chorus (*Med.*, *Her.*, *Hel.*, *Bacch.*). Uniquely, the *Hcld.* has neither monody nor lyric exchange, since the characters who dominate the action are not suited to the emotional register of song. Even Heracles' daughter, the Maiden who is to be sacrificed, sings no lyric, unlike Polyxena (*Hec.* 177-215) and Iphigenia (*IA* 1283-1335, 1475-1509).

The identity of the tragic chorus is rarely determined by the myth itself, but is rather invented by the poet to further the action and ideas of the individual play. In extant tragedy female choruses outnumber male by twenty-one to ten (of course, all choruses were played by men, though not necessarily by ephebes: cf. Parker (1996) 254 n. 127, Csapo and Slater (1995) 352), while Athenian choruses are found in only two others plays (*Ion*, *OC*). In late fifth-century Athens there was a strong feeling of nostalgia for the glorious warriors of Marathon (which Aristophanes could either endorse or satirize as suited his dramatic purpose: cf. *Acharn.* 692-701, *Knights* 1333-4, *Clouds* 985-6, *Wasps* 711, 1075-90, *Lys.* 285). So by presenting a chorus of elderly male citizens of Marathon, Eur. is, as Falkner (1989) 127 points out, 'clearly drawing upon the tradition of the *Marathonomachoi* ["warriors of Marathon"] as

representatives of traditional virtues of Athens' past.' As old men themselves (120), the Chorus naturally sympathize with Iol.'s weak and vulnerable condition (cf. 75-6), while their constant presence before the audience highlights the miracle of Iol.'s off-stage rejuvenation.

73-4 Ah! Ah!: for the excited opening to the parodos, cf. *OC* 117ff. As Wilkins notes (on 69ff.), 'The combination of the entrance of the Chorus, the parodos as an animated exchange in lyrics and trimeters, and the entrance of the kings also in βοηδρομία ["running to a cry for help"] creates a scene of great animation.' In the urgent situation created by Iol.'s cry of distress the Chorus cannot sing and dance a typical parodos of self-introduction or considered reflection; compare the pressing effect of Medea's cries on the Chorus of Corinthian women (*Med.* 131ff.).

75-110 Diggle's text presents a strophe (75-94) and antistrophe (95-110e) after the Chorus' two lyric trimeters; cf. Dale, *MATC* (1983) 46. However, some scholars arrange the lines differently. W. Biehl, 'Die Herstellung von Symmetrien als Kompositionsprinzip in Eur. Heraklid. 73-100 und Hypsipyle Frg. 64 Col. 2', *Hermes* 101 (1973) 35-47, thinks the passage to be astrophic. On the other hand, J. Irigoin, 'La *Parodos* des *Héraclides* d'Euripide', in E. Lucchesi and H. D. Saffrey (eds.), *Mémorial A.-J. Festugière* (Geneva, 1984) 13-21, interprets 73-89 as the strophe, 93-110 as the antistrophe, and 90-92 as a 'mesode'. In his Teubner text of 1972, A. Garzya regards 90-94 as a mesode, but he does not make this clear in his arrangement of the text, as K. Matthiessen, 'Euripidis *Heraclidae*. Ed. Garzya', *Gnomon* 51 (1979) 232-6 points out in his review (p. 235). C. W. Willink, 'Notes on the Parodos-Scene in Euripides' *Heraclidae*, 73-117', *CQ* 41 (1991) 525-9, offers a meticulous reappraisal of the entire passage and his differences from the OCT deserve consideration. He regards 73-7 as an '"entry"-passage', uttered, like the rest of the scene, by the Chorus-leader rather than by the whole Chorus. He defends the integrity of the text (no lacunae at 77 or 110) and interprets strophe and antistrophe as 78-89 ~ 99-110. One possible advantage of Willink's model is that the antistrophe (99-110) begins with a new speaker (the Herald). Another is his attempt to make sense of the text as it stands without marking any loss of lines. Nevertheless, Diggle's strophic arrangement is more satisfying than Willink's non-strophic break at line 90, which seems arbitrary. As it stands, the antistrophe begins with a new topic at 95 and one could defend the Herald's intervention as being more forceful for taking place within the metrical unit at line 99.

75-6 Stoessl (1956) 226 tries to defend L's attribution of these lines to Iol. rather than the Chorus, asking 'Can the same Chorus really ask first what the noise means and then draw its attention to the figure of Iolaus lying on the ground?' The answer is clearly yes. As Mastronarde (1979) 88 explains, the Chorus is not yet in visual contact with the stage at 73-4, but at 75-6 they catch sight of Iol. lying on the ground. **weak old man:** ἁμαλός ('soft', 'tender', 'weak') is used only once in extant tragedy. Its use to describe baby animals (cf. *Il.* 22.310, *Od.* 20.14) is emotive and suggests the Chorus' immediate sympathy for the helpless Iol. The rarity of the word contributed to the misreading of γέροντ' ἁμαλὸν as γέροντα μᾶλλον found in L. In addition, as R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969) 113-14 points out, 'Palaeographically, the change is minimal; scribes often confused λ and λλ.'

76-8 My poor man: the Chorus now address Iol. directly and do so until 98, significantly ignoring the Herald (cf. 99n.). They use trimeters, lyric iambics and dochmiacs, the latter being 'characteristic of tragedy' and with a tone that is 'always urgent or emotional'

(M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982) 108): 75-6 ~ 95-6, 83 ~ 104, 86-7 ~ 107-8, 91-2 ~ 110b-c. By contrast, both Iol. and the Herald use only iambic trimeters. However, it is not certain whether these iambics were spoken or delivered in recitative (i.e. chanted with *aulos* accompaniment, a style of delivery known as *parakataloge*); cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 164 'Our authorities, such as they are, do not require us to believe that *all* iambics found in combination with lyrics were delivered in parakataloge, and the poet was perhaps free to prescribe whatever delivery he required.' Here the context suggests spoken trimeters (cf. Dale (1968) 86, 208), as Iol. responds directly to the Chorus' excited questions, and the Herald delivers his orders. The missing line 76a (corresponding to 97 in the antistrophe) will have continued (in iambic trimeters) the vocative address to Iol. **fall so wretchedly:** for the cognate accusative (πτῶμα πίτνειν) with an adjective, cf. *Ant.* 1045-6, Eur. *El.* 686.

80-1 people who live in the four towns: the Marathonian Tetrapolis was an independent cult-organization, comprising the four towns (later Cleisthenic demes), Marathon, Tricorynthus, Oenoe, and Probalinthus. A large part of its sacral calendar is preserved in an inscription (*IG* II^2 1358), which gives the sacrifices common to the Tetrapolis as well as those of the individual demes; cf. Whitehead (1986) 185, 190-4, 384. However, although the demes functioned in many ways as mini-poleis, they were still, as Krummen (1993) 192 observes, 'socially and politically ... related to the true *polis* of Athens, one which could take partial or total control over the country cults and festivals'; and she adds (p. 202) 'the deme is both a self-contained unit and orientated towards a strong centre, the city, by which it is also ruled.' Thus, at least in the minds of a fifth-century Athenian audience, what was done at Marathon would reflect back on Athens itself.

81-3 Kovacs (1996) 1 defends the simple interrogative ἦ, first proposed by Blaydes, rather than L's ἤ ('**or**'): 'The alternatives are not logical, for the first question ["From what land have you come?"] is compatible with either a mainland or an island origin for Iolaus.' Yet the text as it stands is hardly illogical. **you put in** (κατέχετ'): 'The vivid historic present suits the eagerness of the enquiry' (Pearson). **leaving the shore of Euboea:** the Chorus think of the island closest to them, around 25 kms east of Marathon.

84-5 no islander's life: cf. Stevens on *Andr.* 14 'The word νησιώτης appears to be used here and sometimes elsewhere as a term of disparagement, presumably because in general islands would be poorer in resources than mainland kingdoms.' **I lead:** τρίβω ('I rub', 'wear out') suggests Iol.'s revulsion at the thought of a life of poverty. **from Mycenae:** Iol. has spoken so far of Argos as Eury.'s city (7, 21, 60), but Argos and Mycenae tend to be merged in tragedy. Unlike Argos, which was a major rival of Athens and Sparta, Mycenae was not a powerful military force in the fifth century. Indeed, it had been destroyed by Argos in the 460s (Diod. 11.65, Paus. 8.27.1).

89 mine ... proclamations: lit. 'For this body is not unproclaimed.' The periphrasis ('this body' = 'I') and litotes ('not unproclaimed' = 'widely proclaimed') add to Iol.'s plaintive tone.

95 'πόλεος is a loose gen. of relation' (Pearson), meaning words 'with the city', rather than about or by the city. For an adult male suppliant brought before the Assembly at Athens, cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 354-5.

97-8 these lines depend on the request implicit in 94: '[We ask you as suppliants] not to be handed over...' Their similarity to 221-2 has caused suspicion (cf. 221-2n.) but they

should not be deleted here since they fit both the metrical scheme and the dramatic context. **dragged by force from your gods:** Iol. emphasizes the suppliants' physical contact with the altar. As 101-4 and 111-13 make clear, the Chorus perceive the Herald's behaviour to be both impious and unauthorized: cf. 360-1n.

99-100 as Mastronarde (1979) 88 points out, the Chorus has addressed itself so far only to Iol., although Iol. had pointed to the Herald at 78: 'by his stance and gesture he [the Herald] shows himself to be voluntarily aloof from contact with the chorus.' However, Iol.'s direct request for protection (97-8) prompts the Herald to speak up, reminding Iol. of his subjection to Eury. His language ('masters' (allusive pl.), 'rule you') is forceful and insulting.

101-4 the Chorus react immediately to the Herald's intervention and respond on Iol.'s behalf. **to respect the gods' suppliants:** αἰδώς ('shame', 'respect', 'reverence') is the appropriate response to suppliants: cf. 6n., Cairns (1993) 276-7, Gould (1973) 87 'the feeling of αἰδώς, we may say, is common to both parties in the encounter, or, to put the matter more generally, is characteristic of the encounter itself.' Athenians were proud of their city's reputation as a refuge for abused suppliants: cf. *OC* 258-62, Intro. §3. **sovereign Justice:** Dike is frequently personified as a daughter of Zeus and Themis; cf. Hes. *Th.* 902, *WD* 213-85, Aesch. *Sept.* 662.

105 who belong to Eurystheus: the Herald ignores the Chorus' appeal to justice and simply restates Eury.'s rights of 'possession' (cf. 68).

107 it is impious for a city: Kovacs (1996) 2 would replace πόλει with πέλει (i.e. 'it is an impious thing to give up ...'), but reference to the city seems appropriate given the threat to Athens' sovereignty posed by the Herald's actions (cf. 72, 113).

109 keep out of trouble: for the original proverb ἐκτὸς πηλοῦ πόδα ἔχειν ('keep one's foot out of the mud'), cf. *Cho.* 697, Barrett on *Hipp.* 1293. The combination δέ γε is often found 'in retorts and lively rejoinders' (*GP* 153).

110ff. defective responsion shows that at least five lines are missing here (three from the Chorus, two from the Herald), corresponding to 90-5. Willink (75-110n.), who rejects Diggle's metrical scheme, argues (p. 528) that 111 follows on satisfactorily from 110. However, as Wilkins points out (on 73-110), 'The strength of the Chorus' reply at 111-13 implies a stronger assertion from the herald than is found at 109-10 or 105-6.'

111-13 the Chorus-leader replies to the Herald in normal spoken trimeters. On the Chorus-leader speaking for the whole Chorus in dialogue passages, cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 245-6. **Should you not have spoken ... ?:** Theseus explains how foreign states should behave in such situations, first securing the consent of the country's ruler, even if their cause is entirely just (*OC* 924-8). Here, the Herald's lack of consultation suggests his disregard for justice. **showing respect for the land's independence:** qualifying both 'spoken' and 'not drag'.

114-15 who is king ...?: although Athens is ruled by two kings (34-7), Eury.'s Herald naturally imagines a single figure in charge, and the Chorus' reply (marked by artful word-order, 115) suggests that Dem. governs alone (cf. τυράννωι 111). Acamas does indeed come on stage (119), but Eur. foregrounds Dem. as the ruler of Athens so as not to split the role of the suppliants' saviour. Also, on a more practical level, Eur. only has room for one more speaking character in the next scene (besides the Herald and Iol.), and these lines prepare for Dem.'s dominant role.

116 the argument: the Herald signposts the imminent verbal *agon* with Iol.; cf. *Suppl.* 427-8 and (after the debate) *Phoen.* 588.

118-352: Scene Two (First *Epeisodion*): Demophon, Herald, Iolaus.
The arrival of Dem. and Acamas (118ff.) prepares for the first part of the scene, the formal *agon* ('contest of words') between Iol. and the Herald (134-287). The departure of the Herald (284ff.) leads into a shorter second part, which contains the preparations and mutual praise of Iol. and Dem. (297-352). The scene is divided in two by the choral anapaests at 288-96, which envisage the Herald's exaggerated report of events at Marathon and the Argives' imminent attack.

It is significant that the role of protector is given to Dem. rather than Theseus. The choice of Dem. allows Eur. to show the bond between Heracles and Theseus (a famous episode in Athenian mythology) continuing into the next generation: see Intro. §1(e). Dem. enters in a hurry (σπουδὴν ἔχων 118) in response to Iol.'s cry for help (121, 126). Here, in contrast to most suppliant plays, the protector arrives after the aggressor (cf. Intro. §3). This order of events enhances the tension and the threat of violence in the opening scene. It also makes the *agon* with the Herald more engrossing since the protector has no opportunity to speak with the suppliants and make his decision beforehand (as in Aesch. and Eur. *Suppl.*).

118-19 entrance announcements are often used to identify new characters: cf. U. von Wilamowitz, *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin, 1875) 199ff., Taplin (1977) 71-3. Cf. also Stevens on *Andr.* 494 'καὶ μήν, generally, as here, followed by some part of ὅδε, is the regular formula for introducing a new actor'.

120-3: as Mastronarde (1979) 24 points out, the tragic chorus does not generally attract the attention of the actors, but here 'Demophon naturally seeks information from his fellow-citizens rather than from the as yet unidentified strangers.' **running to a cry for aid** (βοηδρομήσας)**:** Iol.'s appeal motivates a second entrance (cf. 69-72n.). There was an Attic festival known as the Boedromia which was probably connected in some way to military aid. Significantly perhaps, given the location of the play, the festival of remembrance for the battle of Marathon was held on the eve of the Boedromia. If the emphasis here on 'running to help' thereby suggests the battle of Marathon, a link is perhaps being made between Athens' defence of the Hcld. against Eury. and the city's key role in saving Greece from the Persians; cf. 73-117n.

126 cries of pain: ἰυγμός derives from the onomatopoeic cry of pain ἰοὺ ἰού.

127-9 knocked the old man to the ground: The fact that the Chorus are themselves old men increases their sympathy for Iol. and prompts their 'tears of pity'. The bullying of the weak is made worse by the religious context.

130-1 his clothes ... are certainly Greek: the audience could identify foreign characters by their exotic clothing (cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 182-3, 199, Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 278-9). **yet these actions of his are barbaric:** the Herald's brutality is defined as non-Greek. The defeat of the Persian invasions in 490 and 480-79 seems to have consolidated the Greeks' belief in their own moral and intellectual superiority. However, in plays like *Med.*, *Andr.*, and *Hec.*, Eur. engages with contemporary debate about 'natural' ethnic qualities (cf. G. B. Kerferd, *The Sophistic Movement* (Cambridge, 1981) 156-9), and challenges the conventional polarity of Greek and barbarian.

133 what land: ποίας suggests '*what kind* of a land can you have come from with behaviour like this?'

134-287 Twelve of Eur.'s extant tragedies contain an *agon*-scene (*Andr.* has two: 147-273, 547-746). Since these stage *agones* largely predate the surviving speeches of the Attic orators they are valuable evidence for the development of rhetoric in the second half of the fifth century. As inhabitants of a peculiarly litigious and rhetorical culture, the Athenians were connoisseurs of debate and will have appreciated the verbal cut-and-thrust of such scenes. Yet the *agones* have an emotive as well as an intellectual impact. For while they display the kinds of argument used in real speeches, they also evoke the life-or-death situations of the law-court and assembly. Thus the future of the Hcld. depends upon Iol.'s powers of persuasion, and the audience (as well as Dem.) become judges of the arguments. Eur. is fond of having two speakers compete before a third character who judges them: e.g. Polymestor versus Hecuba before Agamemnon (*Hec.* 1132-1292), or Helen versus Hecuba before Menelaus (*Tro.* 914-1059). On the emotional power and theatrical appeal of such 'courtroom drama', see C. Collard, 'Formal Debates in Euripides' Drama', in I. McAuslan & P. Walcot (eds.), *Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1993) 153-66, esp. pp. 156-8.

The *agon* here has has been called 'the most straightforward in Euripides, clear-cut in its issues and regular in its form' (Lloyd (1992) 72). The lucid structure of the scene (speech, counter speech, decision, angry stichomythia, departure of defeated speaker) is well suited to the bold contrasts of character and argument. As S. Usher, *Greek Oratory: Tradition and Originality* (Oxford, 1999) 18 points out, 'The agon in *Heraclidae* (c. 430 BC) contains an early working of the deliberative themes of justice and expediency, and there is already a degree of sophistication as the two speakers, the herald and Iolaus, dispute about two kinds of justice.' In fact, although the Herald does claim to have justice on his side (137-43), his main arguments rely upon an appeal to Athenian self-interest (144-78). In the first section (144-52) the Herald claims that the Athenians would be uniquely foolish if they accepted the Hcld. In the second and longer section (153-78) he seeks to show that a rational calculation of (military) gains and losses tells against protecting the foreign suppliants.

134-7 the Herald responds to Dem.'s injunction (132-3) and opens the debate. Page (on *Med.* 465ff.) claimed that Medea was the only exception to the rule that the unsympathetic character speaks first in Euripides. However, Lloyd (1992) 17 points to further exceptions in *Andr.* and *Phoen.*, and concludes: 'The rule is, in fact, that the plaintiff or claimant speaks first.' **I am from Argos:** the Herald proudly states his nationality, which will prove a crucial factor in his claim to jurisdiction over the Hcld. (cf. 139-40, 175-6, 267).

137-43 the Herald argues first that justice demands the return of the condemned fugitives to Argos. The repetition of words derived from *dikê* ('justice', 'right') reinforces his claim: δίκαι' 138, δίκαιοι ... δίκας 142-3.

138 to enforce and to plead: lit. 'to do and to say'. The adjective δίκαιον is used substantively ('a just claim').

139-42 Argive ... Argives ... from my country ... by the laws there: the Herald's insistent references to Argos imply that the Hcld. do not belong in Attica and that the Athenians have no right to protect them from the force of Argive law. R. Lonis, 'Extradition et prise de corps des réfugiés politiques, in R. Lonis (ed.) *L'Étranger dans le monde grec* (Nancy, 1988) 69-88, comments on this passage that (p. 81) 'the argument seems irrefutable'. However, three factors complicate the situation. Firstly, the Hcld. are

suppliants and so have a right to have their case heard by the host city (cf. also 107-8 for the religious taboo). Secondly, there is no agreement between Argos and Athens governing the return of refugees. Such treaties were made between Greek states, though as Lonis points out (p. 84), actual examples of extradition are very rare. Thirdly, as Iol. himself argues, the Hcld. have been expelled from their city and are therefore no longer subject to its laws: cf. 184-91n.

139-40 I seak to lead back: ἄγω is a conative present; cf. Smyth §1878, Goodwin §25. **from my country:** Kirchhoff suggested replacing ἔχων ('with') with χθονός but 'country' is understood from ἐκ τῆς ἐμαυτοῦ. **runaways:** withδραπέτας the Herald implies that the Hcld. are no more than runaway slaves and the property of Eury. (cf. 175-6, 267). In a slave-owning society like Athens runaways were a major problem (cf. Thuc. 7.27: over twenty thousand slaves flee to the Spartan fortress of Decelea) and it made sense for slave-owners throughout Greece to cooperate in returning them to their 'native' cities.

141-2 condemned ... by the laws: the Herald attempts to make the death sentence appear both legal and democratic. In Athens defendants were tried by mass juries, who voted for or against conviction. The Herald exploits the ψῆφος ('vote') root of ἐψηφισμένους to suggest democratic sanction for the killings, although the decision to execute the Hcld. was made solely by Eury. **to death:** the enjambment of θανεῖν gives emphasis.

142-3 we who inhabit that city ...: the right to make and to enforce its own laws was a fundamental feature of the Greek polis: cf. *OCD*^{3} *s.v.* autonomy. However, the Hcld. are no longer in Argos, and the question whether Argive law still applies to them is by no means as simple as the Herald would have it: see 139-42n. There was no single entity called Greek law, but rather a collection of separate city-state legal systems, and one could not extend laws willy-nilly from one polis to another.

144-78 it is significant that the main part of the Herald's speech focuses not on issues of justice but on Argive power and Athenian self-interest. Thucydides shows how effective (and deadly) such arguments could be in actual political life: cf. the words of the Athenians in the so-called Melian Dialogue 'the standard of justice depends on the equality of power to compel and ... in fact the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept' (Thuc. 5.89, trans. R. Warner).

144-6 a very revealing passage, as the Herald's talk of 'arguments' shades into a scarcely concealed threat. **the hearths of many other people:** the scene is at one now and the Herald expects the same outcome as elsewhere. ἔσταμεν (perf.) = 'we have taken <and maintain> our stand'.

147-52 according to the Herald, the Hcld. must have thought the Athenians to be stupid and reckless. Although the Herald obviously intends this to reflect badly on the Hcld., the suggestion itself is rather tactless, especially given the Athenians' sympathetic reception of the Hcld. a few moments before (cf. 127-31).

147 to you: Diggle 169-70 shows that the construction is ἐς σὲ δεῦρ' ἦλθον ('they have come here to you'). The mistaken link with μωρία is caused by the position of τιν', but as Diggle 170 observes 'the enclitic τις has followed its common tendency to migrate to the front of the sentence'. Contrast Kovacs (1996) 2, who says 'I know of no parallel for

an expression like "seeing some folly ἐς σὲ", the reading of L.' Accordingly, he adopts Hartung's ἐν σοὶ ('seeing some folly in you').

148-9 risking danger: lit. 'to throw danger'; the metaphor derives from the phrase 'to throw a die' (ῥίπτειν κύβον).

149 there will be: Pearson comments 'γενήσεται is, I think, impersonal and employed in a sense similar to that of our colloquial *to come off*.' However, Diggle 169 shows this use to be unlikely and marks a lacuna after 149. I have borrowed Diggle's supplement (see apparatus) and translation.

152 would be ill-advised enough: ἀβούλως means without thinking or taking advice. The Herald now (153ff.) supplies his own version of both.

153ff.: the Herald considers the pros and cons of helping the Held., measuring both in purely military terms (for a similar contrast by an aggressive Herald, cf. *Suppl.* 473-5). He starts with what the Argives can offer Athens in return for their help (155-7), but goes on to stress the negative consequences of their non-cooperation in significantly greater detail (158-74).

153-4 pure calculation of profit might appear ruthless when lives are at stake, but such *Realpolitik* was a fact of Greek life: both the Athenian speakers in the Mytilenean Debate, for example, reject pity and praise self-interest as a motive for action (Thuc. 3.36-50). The crucial point here, however, is that the Herald completely ignores the religious rights of the suppliants (which Dem. considers compelling: 238-9). Cf. Burnett (1976) 6 'His [the Herald's] material preoccupations make a thorough cynic of him; he assumes that all the world is interested only in profit (τί κερδανεῖς; 154; cf. 3 and 21-2) and so quite naturally he tries to bribe the judge.' Moreover, the word *kerdos* ('gain') often has a pejorative undertone, suggesting that Athens is weaker than Argos and should be willing to submit to her for the sake of personal profit and security.

156 army: LSJ *s.v.* χείρ V. 'a body of men, esp. of soldiers'; cf. 337, 1035.

159 grow soft: The verb πεπαίνω describes ripening fruit and is used only here (2nd pers. aor. pass. subj.) of a person (cf. πέπων at *Ag.* 1365, *Eum.* 66); the context suggests a pejorative sense. The Herald is prone to insults: cf. 117, 147, 166-7, 259.

159-60 will have to be settled with the spear: lit. 'becomes a struggle with the spear'. The metaphor derives from wrestling (πάλη), which 'was considered particularly valuable, together with boxing, as a part of military training' (*OCD*^{3} *s.v.* wrestling).

161 a contest of steel: lit. 'a Chalybian contest'. The Chalybes lived on the south-east coast of the Black Sea (cf. Hdt. 1.28, Strabo 11.14.5) and were regarded by the Greeks as the inventors of steel.

162-5 in a series of biting rhetorical questions (note the repetition and interlacing of τί ... ποῖα ... τί ... ποίοις ... τίνος) the Herald imagines how Dem. might attempt to justify war with Argos to his own citizens (cf. πρὸς ἀστῶν 166).

163 what robbed from you: cf. Owen on *Ion* 523 'ῥύσιον means a pledge: so the verb [ῥυσιάζω] is (1) to seize property in distraint and hold it till security is obtained, (2) to be a robber.' Here the second (less flattering) meaning is intended. For a detailed discussion of the word's various senses, including 'plunder' and 'reprisal', see Pritchett (340n.) Part 5 (1991) 86-116.

164-8 If a state has not been robbed of its territory, it might justify war on account of its allies. But are these allies worth dying for (164-5)? The Herald's response is typically

hardheaded: allies are only worth fighting for if they are strong enough to offer protection in return, as Iol. and the Hcld. clearly are not (165-8).

166-7 almost a tomb: for the colloquial and contemptuous tone, see Stevens (1976) 12. Contrast *Med.* 1209-10.

168 get into difficult waters: lit. '[if] you step into the bilge water'; cf. 109n.

169-70 the text of 169 has been widely debated. Diggle (OCT apparatus) suggests ἔξεις for ἐρεῖς and a lacuna after 169 in which 'hope' is defined as 'the hope of soon having the children as allies'. (In the translation I generally replace obelized words rather than translate them literally.) For a different version of the missing line, see Kovacs (1996) 2-3. However, there is much to be said for J. Gibert's version [*BMCR* 96.12.2, a review of Kovacs' Loeb edition], adopting West's (and Murray's) change of μόνον to μόνην: 'You will say, "Hope alone will find the best solution."' **the present offer:** i.e. military alliance with Argos.

172 once grown to adulthood (ἡβήσαντες): the Argives are in fact defeated much sooner by Iol.'s unexpected return to his prime (ἥβη): cf. 851-8.

173-4 in the interval: for the variable (past or prospective) senses of ὁ ἐν μέσωι χρόνος, see Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 588-9. χοὐν (= καὶ ὁ ἐν): double crasis is rare in tragedy: see H. Lloyd-Jones and N. G. Wilson, *Sophoclea* (Oxford, 1990) 214 on *OC* 13 (the only other surviving example). **destroyed:** an emotive word ('to be made an end of'): cf. *Hec.* 369.

175-8 the Herald ends his speech by repeating his offer of alliance with Argos (cf. 155-7) and by appealling once again to Athenian self-interest (cf. 165ff.). As Lloyd (1992) 28 observes, this technique reflects the structure of real-life speeches: 'Eight out of the ten speeches in three-cornered agones end with summaries and appeals, in keeping with rhetorical theory and practice.'

176 and do not, as you like to do: the Herald urges Dem. and the Athenians to abandon their customary role as defenders of the weak. Nicias attempted a similar argument before the Sicilian Expedition, but failed to restrain the Athenians (Thuc. 6.13). Since protecting the weak was an important part of the Athenians' self-conception (e.g. *Suppl.* 378-80), the Herald's advice is unlikely to please his audience. For pity as a 'distinctively Athenian virtue', see Pelling (Intro. n. 115) 17 n. 75. Moreover, the Herald's belittling of the fatherless Hcld.'s future fighting strength (171-3) is unlikely to have impressed an audience who had pitied and admired the sons of the Athenian war dead when they were paraded in the theatre on the opening day of the Great Dionysia (cf. Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 153-4).

177-8 when it is possible: παρὸν is accusative absolute: cf. 7n., 186 (δοκῆσαν). Zuntz 107 prefers λαβών (Reiske) to λαβεῖν (Kirchhoff) but, as Wilkins points out, the infinitive is epexegetic after τοῦτο. **the worse people ... the better:** the Herald exploits the ambiguity of κακίονας and ἀμείνονας, which can also mean the 'weaker' and the 'stronger' people, and implies (in a tone of moral arrogance) that the Argives have justice as well as power on their side.

179-80 Lloyd (1992) 4 observes that this is 'a choral comment of an almost formulaic type which stresses the balance of speeches and leaves no doubt that an agon is in progress'; e.g. *Med.* 520-1, *Hipp.* 981-2, *Andr.* 181-2. As Mastronarde (1979) 34 points out, this technique allows the audience to pause and note the change of speaker. He also suggests

that the manuscript assignment to Dem. 'is perhaps due to the assumption that vocative ἄναξ ['my lord'] in 181 is appropriate only if Demophon has just spoken'. **decide an argument:** γνοίη in this sense has a legal ring (*to determine* who has right on his side): cf. Lys. 22.2.

181-231 Iol.'s reply is a rhetorical *tour de force*. He begins by repudiating the Herald's claim to jurisdiction over the Hcld. (184-91), develops a range of positive arguments for Dem.'s support (191-222), and ends with a powerful appeal to the pitiful condition of the suppliants (223ff.). His speech is of a similar length to the Herald's (51 and 45 lines respectively), and the structural balance itself suggests 'the fairness and impartiality of Athenian justice' (Lloyd (1992) 72).

181-3 Iol. starts by asserting his right (in Athens) to speak in his own defence; cf. Eur. *Suppl.* 438-41. The implied compliment to the Athenian judicial system, and in 183 to Athens itself, which has the courage that other cities lack to stand up to the Herald, makes for a sympathetic opening to his speech.

184-91 Iol. rejects the Herald's claim to legal control over the suppliants: cf. 139-42, 142-3nn. Friis Johansen-Whittle (on Aesch. *Suppl.* 387-91) helpfully compare the situation in Aesch.'s play. There Pelasgus can argue that the Danaids, whose exile is voluntary (5-10), are still subject to Egyptian law. But the Hcld. have been forced to leave Argos (cf. 188), and so Iol. argues that '*expulsion* from their city renders fugitives no longer liable to its jurisdiction'. This is a crucial difference, and Lonis (139-42n.) 82 is wrong to reject Iol.'s argument as a 'desperate objection'.

184 in common: cf. *Ion* 1284.

185 have a share in: μέτειμι is regularly used (impersonally with a dative) to express an individual's participation (or right to participate) in his community: cf. 665, LSJ *s.v.* II.1. Iol. implies that since the Hcld. have been deprived of their ancestral civic rights, Eury. can no longer treat them as Argives.

186 as was decided by vote: Iol. clearly means Eury.'s personal decision: cf. 141-2 and Hutchinson on *Sept.* 198 'The word [ψῆφος] is often used of an individual's decision to punish or acquit.' To be outlawed and stripped of one's rights was a severe punishment in the Greek world (cf. *OCD*^{3} *s.v.* atimia). However, the Hcld. have been disenfranchised not by popular vote but by tyrannical decree. **fugitives from our native land:** the Hcld. are exiles not because they were formally banished by Eury., but because they were forced to flee his sentence of death. φεύγω covers both senses, 'be exiled' and 'escape'; cf. 184-91n.

189 we are foreigners: a brief and striking expression of the Hcld.'s total separation from their Argive past.

189-91 Or do you claim ...?: Iol. turns from Dem. and addresses his opponent in the second person, a technique found in the orators, often (as here) with incredulous questions; he continues to address the Herald until 201, using him as a foil for his praise of Athens and the Athenian character. His question is a *reductio ad absurdum* of the Herald's claim to jurisdiction over the exiled Hcld. Iol.'s talk of *dikê* (δικαιοῦτε 190, δικαίως 187) is itself a riposte to the Herald's argument from justice (e.g. 142-3).

191-201 apart from the respect due to suppliants (223ff.) Iol. has three central arguments in favour of Athenian support. The first concerns Athens' reputation for honour and fearlessness (cf. 207-13 and 214-22 for his appeals to kinship and *charis*). Each part of Iol.'s speech (cor)responds to a part of the Herald's. Thus while 184-91 deny the Herald's opening claim to justice (137-43), this section confronts the Herald's second point (144-52), namely that no city has yet dared stand up to Argos on the Hcld.'s behalf. Iol.'s response is both clever and compelling. For, as Cairns (1993) 278 points out, Iol. repeats the complaint about the mistreatment of suppliants (196), but 'much more is it Iolaus' intention to suggest that failure to protect [the Hcld.] will be taken as a sign of weakness (191-2, 197-8) ... [and] that for the Athenians to fail to fight would be an *aischune* which would impair their *arete* as warriors'. Thus Iol. challenges the Athenians to prove both their courage and their sense of honour.

193-4 this is not Trachis or some Achaean town: according to Hecataeus (cf. Intro. §1(a)), the Hcld. sought protection from king Ceyx of Trachis, but were turned away because Ceyx feared reprisals from Eury. Iol. predicts that Athens, by contrast, will not be so cowardly. It seems more likely that Iol. has Achaea Phthiotis in mind rather than Achaea in the north-east Peloponnese, since Phthiotis (an area of Thessaly) is located close to Trachis on the Malian Gulf; cf. *Ion* 64. πόλισμα appears to be a dignified tragic word (cf. Dunbar on Ar. *Birds* 553) but the contemptuous tone of the sentence is marked by τι ('some').

195 extolling Argos with such words: ὀγκόω can also mean 'to swell': the Herald 'puffs up' Argos with undeserved praise; cf. *Andr.* 319-20.

196 sought to drive away: the imperfect (ἤλαυνες) is conative; cf. Smyth §1895, Goodwin §36.

198 'as [being] any longer free': the participle (οὔσας, agreeing with Ἀθήνας) is understood.

199 But I know: the reoccurence of οἶδα in 198 and 199 prompted Kirchhoff to suggest οὔ φημ' ('I deny') in 198 (accepted by Kovacs (1996) 3-4), but the repetition is natural and emphatic. Iol.'s claim to really know the Athenian character puts pressure on Dem. to live up to it. **spirit:** λῆμα used in a positive sense implies bravery and determination; cf. *Hipp.* 206, *IT* 609.

200-1 Iol. rounds off his praise of Athens with a statement about honour which few Greeks would reject (cf. Dover (1974) 236ff.), and thus furthers his rhetorical aim of securing Athenian protection (cf. 191-201n.).

202-4 Iol.'s justification for ceasing to praise Athens is at the same time covert self-praise, stressing his sense of moderation; cf. *Or.* 1161-2, *IA* 979-80, *Ag.* 468-9.

202 οὖν strengthens the sense of καὶ γὰρ ('for in fact ...' ; cf. *GP* 112): the combination is unique here in Euripides, according to J. T. Allen and G. Italie, *A Concordance to Euripides* (Berkeley, 1954).

205ff. Iol. addresses Dem. directly once again (cf. 181, 189-90n.), but this time his arguments are more personal, invoking ties of kinship between Dem. and the Hcld. and a prior obligation between their parents.

206 you govern: προστατέω ('I rule over') is used here in a positive sense to describe Athens' rulers: cf. 964 (and 349-50, of Athena herself). By contrast, a bad sense is found

in attacks on demagogues who 'lord it over' the people; cf. Collard on *Suppl.* 243, *Or.* 772.

207-13 While the Herald can offer Athens the advantages of military alliance with Argos (153ff.), Iol. must rely on arguments of a different kind. Genealogies are usually found in the prologues of Eur.'s plays (*Suppl.*, *Her.*, *Ion*, *IT*, *Phoen.*, *Or.*, *Archelaus*, *IA*), but here, as in Aesch. *Suppl.* 274-6, 323-4 and *Eur.* Suppl. 263-4, the genealogy is introduced later by the suppliants themselves to further their appeal for protection; cf. *Phil.* 468-72. Ancestry was of great political significance in ancient Greece, so it is understandable that Iol. should try to exploit both the prestige of the Hcld.'s family history and their ancestral connections to the family of Dem.: cf. Gould (1973) 93 'since the paradigm case of a relationship involving bonds of mutual obligation is that of kinship, whether by blood or marriage, we shall not be surprised to find the relationship between ξένοι or that between ἱκέται ... expressed in terms of the language of kinship.'

207-9 Iol. starts with the genealogy most familiar to Dem. Pittheus, king of Troezen in the northern Peloponnese, is said to have made Aegeus (king of Athens) drunk and bedded him with his daughter Aethra, the result being Dem.'s father, Theseus. Not surprisingly, Iol. gives only the basic line of descent here. Contrast Aethra's account at *Suppl.* 3-7. The asyndeton marks the start of an explanation: cf. *Hel.* 23ff., *Trach.* 555ff., Smyth §2167 (b).

209 trace back: for the unique transitive use of ἀνέρχομαι ('go back over'), see Diggle 287; cf. *IT* 256 ἐκεῖσε δὴ 'πάνελθε ('Go back in your story').

210-12 Pelops' daughter is called Lysidice by Plutarch (*Thes.* 7) and Anaxo by Apollodorus (2.4.5). Her (anonymous) role here is to make Alc. the granddaughter of Pelops. Thus Dem. and the Hcld. are related through their grandmothers (Aethra and Alc.), who were first-cousins. Significantly, Eury.'s similar argument from kinship (987-8) does not deter Alc.

213 for the uses of ἥκω + gen. ('I stand in respect of ...'), always accompanied by a modal adverb, cf. Denniston on *El.* 751.

214-22 Iol.'s third argument (cf. 191-201n.) is closely connected to his appeal to kinship, for it relies on the idea of Dem. inheriting an obligation from his father, as Heracles' favours (*charis*; cf. 220) to Theseus are claimed back on behalf of Heracles' sons.

214 this kinship of yours: whereas the infinitive (τοῦ προσήκειν) would refer to kinship in general, the neuter participle suggests a particular instance of it: cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 248 τὸ ... μαινόμενον ('this madness of mine').

215-19 to prove Dem.'s debt to the Hcld. Iol. presents two episodes in which Theseus was benefited by Heracles: (1) the quest for the girdle of the Amazon queen (Antiope or Hippolyte), and (2) the rescue of Theseus from the underworld. However, in the first episode, as we have it (215-17), it is not clear what Theseus owes to Heracles. Combined with the break in syntax between 217 and 218, this suggests that there is a lacuna after line 217, which could have contained an account of Heracles' gift to Theseus, namely the Amazon queen herself. Moreover, since Antiope is recorded as the mother of Dem. (Pind. fr. 176), it is plausible that Iol. should mention her here to remind Dem. of his own uniquely personal debt to Heracles. Kovacs (1996) 4-5, on the other hand, thinks 'the fact that Iolaus was on the same

expedition with Theseus is probably sufficient to create a debt', and he argues that the lacuna contained an introduction to the underworld story instead. Both solutions are possible. In fact the lacuna may have contained other examples of Heracles' assistance as well.

217 the girdle that caused so many deaths: fetching the girdle of the Amazon queen for Eury.'s daughter, Admete, was Heracles' ninth labour; cf. Carpenter (8n.) 125 'Herakles and the Amazons is, after the fight with the lion, the second most popular labour with Attic black-figure vase-painters, appearing on nearly four hundred vases.' In order to punish Theseus for his part in the expedition and to rescue their queen, the Amazons launched a counter-invasion of Attica, but were defeated by Theseus and the Athenians. Iol. thus alludes to a proud episode in Athens' mythic past and one especially dear to Dem. For a discussion of Theseus' emergence in the sixth century as the national hero of Athens, see R. Garland, *Introducing New Gods* (London, 1992) 89-98, S. Mills, *Theseus, Tragedy, and the Athenian Empire* (Oxford, 1997).

218-19 Theseus had gone to Hades with his Lapith friend Pirithous to abduct Persephone. They failed and were imprisoned. Heracles rescued Theseus (cf. *Her.* 619) but Pirithous was left in the underworld. **bears witness** (μαρτυρεῖ): the standard law-court term enhances the rhetorical atmosphere of the scene.

220 grant a favour in return: the Hcld. now call in Theseus' debt to their father (at *Her.* 1336-7 Theseus insists on his debt to Heracles). *charis* (both 'favour' and its 'return') is transferable from one generation to another: cf. *Or.* 244, 453 (Orestes invokes Menelaus' debt to Agamemnon).

221-2 the lines are almost identical with 97-8, and various editors have deleted them (most recently Kovacs (1996) 5). D. L. Page, *Actors' Interpolations in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1934) 40 thought that 97-8 had been copied from their proper place at 221-2, though he was sceptical of the lines being genuinely Euripidean even there (cf. pp. 103-5).

223-31 Iol. ends his speech powerfully, not only repeating his appeals to kinship and Athens' reputation, but also calling attention to the plight of the children and supplicating Dem. personally.

223 and equally in regard to the city: Jackson's correction (ἐν πόλει τ' ἴσον) of the unmetrical reading in L (see apparatus) has been criticized by Kovacs (1996) 6, who calls it 'surprisingly bad and certainly undeserving of a place in Diggle's text'. However, he seems to exaggerate the change of construction required: Wilkins' parallels (on 223) are convincing and the passage makes good sense as it stands. Worth mentioning is the conjecture of Matthiessen (75-110n.) 235 σοὶ γὰρ τόδ' αἰσχρὸν τῆι τε σῆι πόλει κακόν ('this is a disgrace to you and a calamity for your city'), but in this case it is hard to explain where χωρίς came from.

223-5 suppliants, exiles, kinsmen: the asyndeton creates a heightening of emotion (cf. 229-30), as do the parenthetic address to Dem. and the repetition of βλέψον ('look').

226-7 both garlanding ... and by your chin: for the change of καταστέφω ('I garland') to the participle, and the translation, see Diggle 52-3. The metaphor of garlanding turns Iol.'s hands into suppliant wreaths; cf. *Andr.* 894-5. Contact with the knees and chin are exemplary suppliant gestures: cf. Intro. n. 85.

229-30 repetition of γενοῦ and asyndeton mark Iol.'s emotional peroration. The appeal to Dem. to act like a relative recalls Andromache's moving argument that Hector is all the

family she has left: 'But Hector, you are father to me and honoured mother and brother, and you are my strong husband too' (*Il.* 6.429-30; cf. *Aj.* 514-19, *Cho.* 238-44). Here, however, the desperate situation of the Hcld. is emphasized by the final surprising element ('friend, father, brother, **master**'): loss of status is preferable to the despotism of Eury.

232-5 as often, the emotional response of the Chorus guides that of the audience; cf. P. E. Easterling, 'Form and Performance', in P. E. Easterling (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge, 1997) 151-77, p. 163 'One of the major functions of the chorus ... is to act as a group of "built-in" witnesses, giving collective and usually normative responses to the events of the play.'

232 I pity (ὤικτιρ'): cf. M. Lloyd, 'The Tragic Aorist', *CQ* 49 (1999) 24-45, p. 43 on the category of 'emotional aorists': 'The aorist is ... used in expressions of pity of the type ὤικτιρ' ἀκούσας (E. *Hcld.* 232), where it is usually emphasized by a participle of a verb of perception that the pity is a specific emotion prompted by something in the recent past.' **for their suffering:** a causal genitive is common after verbs of emotion: cf. Dale on *Alc.* 832.

233-4 utterly defeated: μάλιστα goes with νικωμένην, but the hyperbaton is remarkable.

236-52 Dem. announces his support for the Hcld. It is likely that Dem. communicates his intentions non-verbally as well by raising Iol. to his feet, a symbolic act of acceptance in suppliant situations: cf. Gould (1973) 79. Unlike Pelasgus (Aesch. *Suppl.* 366-9) and Theseus (Eur. *Suppl.* 354-5, 393-4), Dem. does not seek democratic authorization before making his decision. Here at least the *Hcld.* seems less overtly concerned with fifth-century Athenian procedures: the reaction of the Chorus is sufficient to suggest popular support for Dem.'s actions. Later, however, the Athenian *demos* emerges as no longer stable or obedient (415-19) when faced with the crisis of human sacrifice (408-9), and Dem.'s decision to support the Hcld. leads to the danger of civil war. This shifting picture of the polis (at one moment a unified community under a king, the next a city full of factions) is typical of tragedy, which moves freely between the aristocratic world of heroic myth and the democratic realities of fifth-century politics.

236 three kinds of conscience: L's reading 'three kinds [lit. "ways"] of misfortune' does not fit the context (συμφορᾶς has perhaps been mistakenly copied from 232). Pearson suggests that συμφορά might mean 'compliance' here, but that seems to be stretching the meaning of the word too far. Schmidt's correction (συννοίας) gives good sense: Dem.'s talk of conscience signals the moment when he takes personal responsibility for the safety of the Hcld. His three reasons for doing so (religion, kinship and *charis* (taken together), honour) respond directly to the grounds of Iol.'s appeal (cf. 191-201n.), and Dem. implies that Iol. has won the argument concerning justice as well (see 250-2n.). As Paley notes, 'The idea is borrowed from three separate roads meeting in one point.' As a parallel for the metaphor, cf. *Or.* 633.

238-9 Dem. begins with the most powerful moral sanction, Zeus, god of suppliants, whose temple and altar frame the action, both scenically and thematically: cf. *Suppl.* 301-2, 561-3, Parker (1983) 185 'the involuntary host was not free to step back and leave the pursuers to risk the consequences of violation, as it was his own altar that would be defiled.' **this gathering of fledglings:** the image of the children as young birds (cf. 10n.,

Cho. 247, 256, 500-1) suggests that Dem. himself now shares Iol.'s protective feelings for the Hcld.

241 for the sake of their father: lit. 'being a favour (owed) to their father'; the phrase is acc. in apposition to the sentence: LSJ *s.v.* χάρις VI.1.b.

242 dishonour: Dem.'s concern about αἰσχύνη acknowledges Iol.'s arguments (200, 223). Significantly, Dem. discusses this motive more fully than any other (242-6); cf. Aethra's crucial argument from honour and reputation at *Suppl.* 306-25, where she persuades Theseus to accept the request of the suppliant Adrastus and the mothers of the Seven against Thebes.

243 pillaged: since suppliants are thought of as the god's property Dem. would be abetting temple robbery if he handed over the Hcld.

244-6 a free country ... for fear of Argives: Dem. is concerned for the city's reputation as well as his own (cf. 461-3): Athens' sovereignty cannot be questioned, nor can he be suspected of cowardice (Aethra plays on such fears at *Suppl.* 314-19).

246 lit. 'and this is close to hanging'. The phrase is colloquial here (*pace* Stevens (1976) 10), expressing disgust (cf. Ar. *Ach.* 125). Dem. is not thinking literally of hanging himself (contrast Orestes at *Eum.* 746).

248 anyone: i.e. the Herald; cf. Bond on *Her.* 748 'τις referring obliquely to a definite person (LSJ, A3) is primarily menacing.' τις can also refer threateningly to the person addressed (e.g. *Aj.* 1138). The word's vagueness and ambiguity can be exploited for ironic effect: cf. *IT* 548, *Ant.* 751.

250-2 Having reassured Iol. and the Hcld. of his support, Dem. turns abruptly to the Herald ('You there') and explicitly raises the issue of Eury.'s legal rights, which had been central to the Herald's case (cf. 137-43). Lloyd (1992) 75 comments 'It is interesting that Demophon does not, in the event, decide in Iolaus' favour because he agrees with him on this narrower question of law and justice ... Demophon accepts the suppliants primarily because they are suppliants.' However, although Dem. mentions other motives first, the issue of justice is clearly a factor in his decision (cf. 253-4).

252 he will meet with justice: Dem. shows a typically Athenian pride in the fairness of the legal system.

253ff. In Euripides' *agones* the main speeches or, as here, the judgement speech are regularly followed by stichomythia. Here, as often in such exchanges, the differences between the characters are elaborated in heated dialogue; cf. E.-R. Schwinge, *Die Verwendung der Stichomythie in den Dramen des Euripides* (Heidelberg, 1968) 33-56.

253 Dem.'s talk of justice (252) provokes the Herald to repeat his legal claim. His τι answers that of Dem. in 251.

254 the simple question exposes the hypocrisy of the Herald's actions.

255-6 Significantly, the Herald does not attempt to answer Dem.'s question. Instead he changes tack and admits that to hand over the suppliants would be shameful (255), while misleadingly implying that it would be so only to himself. However, as Dem. realizes (256), such sophistry obscures the threat of divine punishment (see next note). **It *does* harm me:** for γε in 'affirmative answers contradicting a denial', see *GP* 132; cf. 272.

257-8 the Herald suggests banishment as if the gods would not resent the suppliants' forcible removal from the altar itself: cf. 238-9n.

259 the indiscriminate nature of suppliancy made it potentially problematic: cf. *Ion* 1312-19, Sinn (Intro. n. 91) 91 'Since criminals, even convicted murderers, had the right to perform the rite of hiketeia [supplication], it was all too often a matter of calming emotions running high, hindering acts of revenge, and instead setting in motion orderly criminal proceedings - since the suppliant could not avoid paying for his crime.'

260 the line is reminiscent of Aesch. *Suppl.* 83-5 (the altar is a refuge open to all), where the rare word ῥῦμα, 'defence', is also found.

261 ἴσως ('perhaps') here at line end is threatening rather than tentative; cf. 327.

264 **be harmed yourselves:** in Dem.'s opinion it is outrageous that his authority be dependent on whether he 'harms' (i.e. disobeys) the Argives.

267 **taking what is mine:** cf. 68, 105, 139, 175. The Herald is running out of new arguments.

270 an even stronger echo of Aesch. *Suppl.* (cf. 260 above): Pelasgus warns the Herald of Aegyptus κλαίοις ἂν εἰ ψαύσειας οὐ μάλ' ἐς μακράν ('If you touch them you'll regret it right away!', 925). Barrett on *Hipp.* 1086 notes that the idiom κλαίων with a future verb is used 'to indicate that the action of the verb will be *followed* by unpleasant consequences'. So here it is equivalent to ἁψάμενος κλαύσῃ.

271-3 Heralds fulfilled a range of political, legal, and ritual functions in Greek society. One of their most distinctive roles (seen in tragedy as well as the historians) was that of public messenger, travelling with news from state to state, occasionally authorized, as here (see 274-83), to deliver a declaration of war: cf. F. Adcock and D. J. Morley, *Diplomacy in Ancient Greece* (London, 1975) 153 'The presence of heralds in exchanges between states was a virtual acknowledgement that war existed even if it had not been declared.' A herald was felt to be inviolable (cf. D. Lateiner, 'Heralds and Corpses in Thucydides', *CW* 71 (1977) 97-106, p. 99, and the personal immunity of modern diplomats), and only in exceptional wartime circumstances was he not guaranteed a hearing by the opposing side: cf. Thuc. 2.12. The Herald of Eury. is conscious (and proud) of his status, but goes beyond his powers in trying to force suppliants from the public altar of a foreign state. He no doubt carries a distinctive herald's staff or sceptre, a symbol of his authority and inviolability (compare the staff held by the herald on the vases discussed in Intro. §6). It would be a nice (and typically Euripidean) irony if he had used the same staff to knock Iol. to the ground at 67-8. Nevertheless, since heralds enjoyed sacred inviolability (cf. Hdt. 7.136.2), Dem.'s threat of violence naturally appalls the Chorus. It is disquieting for an Athenian audience to see one of their kings acting impiously, even under provocation. But why should Dem. appear bumbling and lacking in statesmanship? This is the first sign that the Athenians are far from being paragons of virtue, a point that will be exploited more fully and much more disturingly in the final scene (cf. esp. 1021n.). The audience may have been reminded of a version of the myth in which Eury.'s Herald was killed by the Athenians (but cf. Intro. n. 61). In any case, the abuse of heralds and ambassadors was a particularly contentious issue at the start of the Peloponnesian War. According to Plut. *Per.* 30.3 and Paus. 1.36.3, an Athenian herald, Anthemocritus, was murdered by the Megarians in 431 (and apparently received hero-cult after his death: cf. Seaford (1994) 129), while in 430 the Athenians themselves were equally ruthless in their treatment of captured Spartan ambassadors: cf. Hdt. 7.137, Hornblower on Thuc. 2.67.4.

274-83 the Herald's departing speech raises the tension significantly, for he now reveals that Eury. is waiting on the borders of Attica, making the Argive invasion appear imminent.

275-6 lit. 'a great bronze spear of Argive Ares'. For the metonymy of αἰχμή ('spear'), see Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 78; cf. also δόρυ (803), ἀσπίς (932). The use of bronze weapons has, following Homer, a heroic tinge: the Herald seeks to intimidate by presenting the Argives as formidable fighters. The mention of Ares is intended to have a similar effect.

278-9 Alcathous' land (= Megara, whose kingship Alcathous won by killing a menacing lion): situated midway between Athens and Corinth, Megara controlled key routes between the Peloponnese and Attica, making it a highly strategic place for both Sparta and Athens. Megara had revolted from Athens in 446, enabling the Spartans to invade Attica. In the build up to the Peloponnesian War, according to Thucydides, the Spartans' main demand was the repeal of Athens' Megarian Decree, which banned Megarians from all harbours in the Athenian empire and from the (economically vital) Athenian market-place (1.67.4, 1.139). When war finally broke out, Athens invaded the Megarid twice a year between 431 and 424 (Thuc. 2.31.3). Eury.'s position on the edge of the Megarid is therefore particularly significant since it associates him with the Spartans who had recently invaded Attica (cf. Intro. §7 for the play's likely production date of 430), making his subsequent role as protector of Athens, and the Hcld.'s status as ancestors of the Spartans, all the more paradoxical and surprising: cf. Intro. §2(b), 928-1055, 1026-44, 1034-6nn.

280-1 insolence: '*hybris*', an interesting word for the Herald to use (cf. 17-18n.) and perhaps a reference to 270-3. **fiercely:** λαμπρός combines the idea of 'vigorous action' (LSJ *s.v.* I.5) with the 'bright' shine of armour. **against this land and its crops:** Eury.'s prospective devastation of the Attic countryside again recalls Spartan tactics in the early years of the Peloponnesian War (cf. Thuc. 2.18-23 for the first invasion of 431, 278-9n.). The aim of such invasions, which were a typical feature of Greek warfare, was the demoralizing and debilitating destruction of the enemy's agricultural infrastructure, including grain, olive trees, and vines: cf. V. D. Hanson, *Warfare and Agriculture in Classical Greece* (Berkeley, 1998^2) 42-76. In largely agrarian societies like classical Greece the devastation of crops would seriously undermine the enemy's ability to continue hostilities. The (unusual) policy of Pericles was to abandon the Attic countryside and rely on imports. Nevertheless, the Herald's threat would have a chilling resonance for an Athenian audience *c.* 430, since some will have suffered direct damage to their land and property and all will have been affected by the movement of the rural population within the city walls. (The plague broke out in Athens in 430.)

282-3 the Dorians (including the Argives) frequently contrasted their martial strength with the supposed 'softness' of the Ionians (including the Athenians): cf. J. H. M. Alty, 'Dorians and Ionians', *JHS* 102 (1982) 1-14, pp. 7-9.

284-7 Taplin (1977) 222 comments on such 'lines cast at a departing back': 'The device tends to lack dignity, and is often used to lower the tragic or heroic tone.' Here the technique signals Dem.'s intense anger, which has already brought him close to committing an ignominious and unheroic act (271-3n.).

284 To hell with you: cf. Stevens on *Andr.* 708 'φθείρεσθαι [lit. 'to be destroyed'] and compounds are used of angry dismissal in Eur. and Comedy.' Bond on *Her.* 1290 notes

that its use need not be undignified, but here the colloquial tone suits Dem.'s enraged temper; cf. 67-8n. **this Argos of yours:** a contemptuous phrase, which throws the Herald's boastful Argos (283) back in his face; cf. *Suppl.* 127.

285 shame me: cf. 242n.

286-7 not subject ... but free: Athens' freedom is asserted once again (cf. 62, 198, 244, *Suppl.* 518-20) but this time Dem.'s remark is sharpened by ὑπήκοος, a word used in Eur.'s time to describe cities that were subject to Athens itself (Thuc. 7.57). Though they might sometimes try to disguise the fact with talk of 'allies' (cf. Thuc. 1.97.1), the Athenians knew that their rule over the other members of the Delian League was an imperial one: cf. Thuc. 2.41.3, 2.63.2 (Pericles addressing the Athenians) 'Your empire is now like a tyranny: it may have been wrong to take it; it is certainly dangerous to let it go' (trans. R. Warner). Dem.'s language stresses Argos' degrading treatment of Athens.

288-96 There is some doubt whether these lines (and 702-8) were spoken or recited with *aulos* accompaniment (see Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 156-67, esp. 161-2), but the predominantly recitative use of anapaests favours the latter; more significantly, the urgency of the opening lines (288-91) and the scornful tone of the remainder demand a more emotional style of delivery than pure speech. Kovacs (Loeb) gives both 288-96 and 702-8 to the Chorus-leader, but their mixture of advice and moralizing suits delivery by the whole Chorus. Zuntz 40 calls it 'a lively and even humorous little song which stands as a bright dividing mark between the debate with Kopreus and Iolaus' subsequent exhortation and thanks.'

289-90 Argive ... Mycenaeans: cf. 84-5n.

290 warlike spirit: a meaning derived by metonymy from the god. Cf. Burkert (1985) 169 'Ares embodies everything that is hateful in war; the splendour of victory, Nike, is reserved for Athena.' Accordingly, the Argives are associated with Ares (cf. 275), while Iol. invokes Athena (350-2; cf. 849-50).

292-3 The role of heralds as go-betweens was problematic since it meant they could be criticized as mere lackeys (cf. *Tro.* 424-6, 'servants of tyrants') and opportunists (*Or.* 895-7), or accused of adding to the message (Eur. *Suppl.* 426). The Chorus' behaviour reflects the Herald's ambiguous status, defending him from violence (cf. 271-3n.) before calling him a liar here.

293 to build up: lit. 'to build a tower', i.e. to exaggerate. The verb is often used in a pejorative sense, e.g. *Med.* 526.

295-6 barely escaped being torn apart: διακναίω ('scrape', 'grind') produces a strong metaphor. The Herald is imagined accusing the Athenians of nearly lynching him.

297-328 After the departure of the Herald the Chorus' mid-scene anapaests lend the action new impetus: 'It is time to think ahead ...' (288; cf. *Med.* 357-63 following Creon's departure, 759-63 following Aegeus'). However, it is only at 335ff. that Dem. actually begins to announce his preparations for the Argive attack. Before this Iol. delivers this speech combining several ideas that are relevant to the development and impact of the play. It falls into four parts: (1) general reflection on the value of noble birth (297-303); (2) physical confirmation of the bond between the Hcld. and the Athenians (303-8); (3) an appeal to the Hcld. never to attack Athens (309-19); and (4) praise for Dem. personally (320-8).

297-8 cf. Hall (Intro. n. 7) 99 'The contradiction between democratic ideals and the continuing respect for nobility produces frequent tragic discussions of the inheritability of virtue, but on balance the statements on nature versus nurture are surprisingly reactionary'. For the positive effects of 'nurture', cf. *Andr.* 636-8; for the wider debate, see Collard on *Hec.* 592-602.

299-301 reference to extra-marital sex is out of place here (the lines interrupt the focus on good birth) and the passage is likely to be an interpolation (cf. *Andr.* 1279-83, Zuntz 110-11). Wilkins suggests (on 297-303) that the lines may have came into the text from Stobaeus' collection of literary quotations (4.29.46) or its sources. Excerptors were particularly fond of such moralizing passages; cf. note on Fragment 5 (949 N) below.

302-3 for the ability of noble birth to withstand suffering, cf. Soph. *OC* 7-8; contrast 233 above. Iol.'s emphasis on good birth prepares for its moving embodiment in the daughter of Heracles in the following scene: cf. 409, 513, 626-7.

303-8 Iol. illustrates his gnomic reflection from the Hcld.'s own experience.

305-6 alone in ... Greece: for Athens' unique reputation as protector of the weak, cf. 176n., *Suppl.* 184-91, Isoc. 14.1-2. **inhabited:** the word may connote ἡ οἰκουμένη (γῆ) in the sense of land settled by Greeks (as opposed to barbarians), i.e. civilized areas, where one would expect to see suppliants respected. **defended these children:** lit. 'stood in front of these ones', with a gesture towards the Hcld., followed by direct address in the next line.

307-8 for the repetition of δότε, cf. *Med.* 1069-70, where the effect is more pathetic (so 225 above), as Medea bids farewell to her children. The word here is emphasized further by being placed at both the beginning and the end of the line. For the clasping of the right hand as 'a pledge of good faith', see Dover on Ar. *Clouds* 81. The Hcld.'s 'pledge' to the Athenians is elaborated in the following lines.

309-19 Iol. urges the Hcld., once they have returned home to the Peloponnese, never to wage war with Athens. His words seem at this point a regular expression of gratitude, but they are later undone when the Hcld. are unexpectedly revealed as the ancestors of Athens' future enemies (cf. Intro. §2(b), 1034-6n.).

310 return: νόστος is used here of the Hcld.'s return to the Peloponnese (cf. 587). 'Return home' is the usual sense of the word, familiar both from the *Odyssey* and the *Nostoi*, a post-Homeric epic which recounted the returns of various Greek heroes from Troy (cf. M. Davies, *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol, 1989) 80-6). Return to their ancestral lands is therefore the natural and hoped for end of the Hcld.'s sufferings, though it takes place outside the play (cf. 875-8). Contrast the final and surprising use of νόστος by Eury. (1042n.).

311 although οἰκήσητε can be taken in zeugma with both nouns (i.e. 'if you take possession of your home and father's rights'), νομίζετε lacks an object (= the Athenians). Pearson's claim that this can be supplied from φίλων in 309 is unconvincing; a lacuna seems necessary. For Elmsley's supplement, which I translate, see the apparatus.

313-14 Since the imperatival infinitive (αἴρεσθαι) would be acceptable Greek (cf. Goodwin §784), one can understand why Pearson, for example, preferred to leave L's reading unchanged. However, Wilkins' defence of Kirchhoff's μέμνησθέ μοι and Murray's

τήνδ' for L's μεμνημένοι τῶνδ' ('remembering these things') is ultimately convincing. Among other points he notes that 'the imperatival infinitive is rarer in Euripides than in Sophocles and Aeschylus.' In addition, the OCT's greater emphasis on remembering seems better suited to the spirit of Iol.'s speech.

315 **consider:** on the repetition of νομίζετε so soon after 312, cf. Diggle 532 under 'repetition: careless', Willink on *Or.* 10.

316 for Pelasgian meaning Argive, cf. e.g. *Phoen.* 107. Pelasgus was king of Argos when the Danaid suppliants arrived from Egypt (Aesch. *Suppl.*; cf. 184-91, 270nn.). Willink on *Or.* 691-3 notes that the epithet 'Pelasgian' has a "grandiose" effect (derived from the epic Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος (*Il.* 2.681), though there it refers to a region of Thessaly), while on *Or.* 1601 he comments 'the "antique" epithet has a solemn flavour'. Here Iol. uses an imposing adjective in order to magnify the courage of the Athenians.

317 the infinitive ἔχειν expresses the result of ἀπηλλάξαντο ('so as to have them as enemies', cf. 163), whose (aorist) middle voice is appropriate to an action which affects the agent (Smyth §1714).

318-19 the idiomatic ἀλλ' ὅμως ending a line often prompts interpolation (cf. Bond on *Her.* 1366, Renehan (75-6n.) 28-9). Wilkins argues against Diggle's deletion of 319 on the grounds that it is not clear what words are meant to be understood after the ellipse. However, if final ἀλλ' ὅμως has the force of 'but still' in English (so Dodds on *Bacch.* 1027-8), the sense is clear: 'but still they incurred their emnity'.

320-8 the final part of Iol.'s speech is addressed directly to Dem., whom he praises as being no worse than his heroic father, Theseus. Iol. imagines meeting Theseus face to face in the underworld: the *locus classicus* for such a meeting and praise is *Od.* 11.467ff., where Odysseus encounters Achilles in the underworld and tells him of the heroic exploits of his son, Neoptolemus (11.505-37).

320 'ὅταν θάνω is not so much tautologous as euphemistic' (Pearson).

321 **sir:** ὦ τᾶν has excited much disagreement. On the one hand, Dodds comments (on *Bacch.* 802) 'This expression (of uncertain derivation) is a polite and respectful form of address (πρόσρημα τιμητικῆς λέξεως Hesych.), not a condescending one'. On the other hand, Wilkins (on 321) finds its usual tone of 'condescension or impatience or urgency' difficult to account for here. (Kovacs (1996) 7 agrees and suggests replacing it with Broadhead's ἑστὼς, 'I shall stand next to Theseus ...'.) However, the problem disappears if one recognizes that the tone of the word depends on the context (cf. Stevens (1976) 42-3): here the tone is respectful but at 688 there is a touch of exasperation and irony in the Servant's address.

325-8 Iol. returns to his opening theme ('ring-composition') with another gnomic reflection on the nature of good birth (cf. 297-303). The idea that past generations were far superior is a topos of Greek thought (cf. Hes. *WD* 106-201, the five races of mankind). Dem.'s conduct is all the more remarkable because it belies the general trend of degeneration.

326 **you are not actually inferior:** lit. 'you succeed in being'; τυγχάνω is an apt word to express Dem.'s achievement. γεγὼς (the contracted perf. part. of γίγνομαι, 'I am born') stresses Dem.'s noble origins once again (cf. *Med.* 406). οὐδὲν is used adverbially: 'in no respect'.

327 as few others are: lit. 'with few others'. παύρων recalls *Od.* 2.276-7 (Mentor (= Athena) to Telemachus) '*Few* sons in fact are like their father: most are worse, but *few* are better than their father.' Telemachus' struggle to live up to his father's reputation is a leitmotif of the *Odyssey*, and the test is applied to the sons of many other heroes, e.g. *El.* 336-8 (Orestes), *Phil.* 1310-13 (Neoptolemus, cf. 320-8n.), including the Hcld. themselves: cf. Lys. 2.13, where the Athenians are praised for helping the Hcld. ἐκείνους τ' οὐκ εἰδότες ὁποῖοί τινες ἄνδρες ἔσονται γενόμενοι ('although they did not know what kind of men they would prove to be'). In a patriarchal society such as classical Greece there was enormous pressure on young men to live up to the reputation of their father (or, if their father had been bad, to reject his example and save the family reputation as far as possible): cf. B. S. Strauss, *Fathers and Sons in Athens* (London, 1993) 72-81. In addition, Athens was almost continually at war in the fifth century, leaving many sons fatherless (cf. 176n.); in such a context, and given the prevailing Greek ideology linking warfare and manhood, many Athenian men will have felt an obligation to match the courage of their fallen fathers. Combined with the specific circumstances of the play, this feature of Athenian father-son relationships further guides the (largely Athenian male) audience to approve of Dem.'s support for the Hcld.

329-32 the Chorus-leader relates Dem.'s current support for the Hcld. to Athens' conduct in the past. On the Athenians' altruistic self-image cf. 176, 305-6nn., and Bond on *Her.* 1163, where Theseus comes to help the family of Heracles in Thebes against the tyrant Lycus.

329-30 always (ἀεί ποτε)**:** cf. Griffith on *Ant.* 456-7 'ποτε helps the phrase to stretch indefinitely into the past as well as the future'. **in accordance with justice:** a decisive phrase (cf. 104, 252-4), rather than 'where justice is on her side' (Pearson), or (with τοῖς ἀμηχάνοις) 'if justice is on their side' (J. Davie).

333-4 I am confident: for αὐχῶ with infinitive meaning 'I feel confident that', see Barrett on *Hipp.* 952-5. **just as you say:** i.e. as advocated by Iol. in 310-15. **our favour** (χάρις)**:** Theseus' debt to Heracles (cf. 220n.) is now discharged and replaced by the Hcld.'s debt to Athens.

335-40 Dem. announces his preparations for the Argives' imminent attack (cf. 275ff.).

339 in Argos: a locative dative; cf. 360-1. **quickly mobilized:** cf. *Or.* 1530. The specific sense of βοηδρόμος is determined by the military context; cf. 120-3n., Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 1432. Insofar as Argos is associated with Sparta, the Argives' military preparedness suggests that of classical Sparta, a society which the Athenian orator Isocrates simply called 'a military camp' (Isoc. 6.81); cf. Thuc. 2.39 for an extreme example of the contrast between the professional militarism of Sparta and the amateur (i.e. effortless) approach of the Athenians.

340 arrange sacrifices: Dem.'s use of the middle voice (θύσομαι) signals that he will not perform the ritual himself, but will order others to do it for him; cf. Smyth §1725. W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War*, Part 1 (California, 1971) 109-15 explores the distinction between ἱερά, sacrifices performed in the town or camp before setting out to fight (as announced here by Dem.), and σφάγια, those performed on the battlefield just before the fighting begins. The *Hcld.* contains both types of sacrifce: cf. 399-401, 819-22.

340-3 the strength of Dem.'s support for the Hcld. is expressed by his willingness to take the suppliants under his own roof. **go into the palace:** the palace is imagined as being close to the altar and temple of Zeus. However, we are not meant to ask about precise locations or distances: the topography is fluid so that Marathon and Athens merge together (cf. 32n.).

344 **I will not leave the altar:** the optative with ἄν expresses a strong negative and a 'fixed resolve'; cf. 66, 547, Smyth §1824 (a). Albini (1993) 109 is being too subtle when he suggests that Iol. refuses to leave the altar because he fears betrayal by Athens. Besides the protective power of the sacred space (cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 492-6, *OC* 643-67), there are good dramatic reasons for Iol.'s decision to stay at the altar: both he and the Hcld. remain on stage to confront the crisis of human sacrifice in the following scene (381ff.).

347-52 Iol.'s closing words are intended to encourage Dem. and the Hcld. for the struggle ahead. The image of gods fighting on opposing sides is familiar from epic. In the *Iliad* Hera and Athena both support the Greeks, but here the goddesses' local affiliations divide them.

348 **than those of the Argives:** lit. 'than the Argives [have]', genitive of comparison.

349 **their defender is Hera:** at *Il.* 4.51-2 Hera says that the three cities dearest of all to her are Argos, Sparta and Mycenae. Like Athena at Athens, Hera was worshipped at Argos as a protector of the polis. One of her most important sanctuaries (the Argive Heraion) lay nearby. In myth Hera's hostility to Heracles is the source of his family's sufferings. Eury. later claims to have been afflicted by Hera himself (989-90).

351 **to get the support:** lit. 'to meet with/ get better gods'; cf. *Suppl.* 594. For the epexegetic infinitive (τυχεῖν) after τοῦτο, cf. 177-8.

352 **Pallas will not endure being defeated** (νικωμένη): cf. 290n., R. Parker, 'Gods Cruel and Kind: Tragic and Civic Theology', in Pelling (Intro. n. 60) 150 'this ... claim is, as it were, a logical truth, since she was worshipped at Athens under the title 'Victory' [Νίκη]'. By invoking the power and the loyalty of Athena, Iol. appeals to the preconceptions of his Athenian listeners (both on stage and in the audience); cf. 770-2, 920-5.

353-80: Second Song (First *Stasimon*) of the Chorus.

The Marathonian Chorus sing a remarkably direct and vigorous ode in response to the Argive threat, first addressing the Herald, whose impiety and arrogance they repudiate, and then Eury., the ultimate source of the impending war. Their prediction of victory for Athens continues the confident tone of Iol.'s words at the end of the last scene (347-52), and prepares for the shock at the start of the next (381-2), when Dem. returns with the oracles' demand for a human sacrifice (403ff.).

The ancient tradition contains many references to the beauty of Eur.'s lyrics (e.g. Plut. *Nic.* 29.2-3, *Mor.* 5.706d), and the 'New Music' style of his late plays proved particularly popular in the post-classical period; cf. J. Herington, *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (California, 1985) 44-5, 109. (For a sketch of fifth-century musical developments in tragedy, see A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings, Volume I* (Cambridge, 1984) 62-3, T. J. Mathiesen, *Apollo's Lyre* (Lincoln, Nebraska, 1999) 103-25.) There is comparatively little song in the *Hcld.* (cf. 73-117n., a factor in the play's low estimation?), but in each of its odes the Chorus express a coherent and significant reaction to the events around them (cf. 608-29, 748-83, 892-927nn.).

The first stasimon takes the form of strophe-antistrophe-epode, a structure used in *parodoi* as well (*Hipp.*, *Andr.*, *Suppl.*, *Her.*, *Bacch.*). The strophe and antistrophe probably shared the same music (cf. Dale (1968) 204-6) and perhaps the same choreography. Unfortunately, we possess very little information about the mimetic dance forms of the tragic chorus (cf. Pickard-Cambridge (1968) 246-57, Wiles (1997) 87-113). If we suppose that the suppliants' altar was in the orchestra (cf. Intro. §5), it is possible that the Chorus danced in a circle around it. However, their song is directed not inwards to the Hcld. at the altar, but outwards to figures not present on the stage (the Herald and Eury.).

Wilamowitz (1882b) 347 thought it impossible that the Chorus could begin by addressing someone who had already departed at line 284 (cf. Page (221-2n.) 39). He suggested instead that this song might originally have stood before the anapaests at 288, and that here it has displaced an ode to Athena. However, as Mastronarde (1979) 98-9 has shown, although the opening address to the Herald is 'exceptionally mimetic', there is 'nothing suspicious in the dramatic technique of this passage'. For choral address of figures not present on stage, cf. e.g. *Hipp.* 141ff., *IT* 1123ff.

The metre is mostly Aeolo-choriambic, made up of various cola, the most common being the glyconic: for a list of the basic Aeolic cola, see West (76-8n) 30-1. For a detailed description of the cola used here, see Wilkins 95-6, Dale (1968) 146 with n. 2. Cf. also Dale, *MATC* (1981) 76-7.

355 stranger from Argos: the Chorus stress that the Herald is a foreigner who has no right to behave in Athens as he does.

356-7 your big talk ... my heart: the non-Aeolic metre (Archebulean), rare in tragedy (cf. Dale (1968) 163), is expressive: the accelerated rhythm emphasizes the Chorus' agitation and defiance.

358-60 may this never befall: cf. Collard on *Hec.* 1278 'μήπω "not yet" approximates to μήποτε ["never"] in prayers'. **great Athens with her beautiful dancing-grounds:** dancing, like poetry and music, was an integral part of Greek life. Homer depicts a dancing-ground and two types of dance in a joyful scene on the shield of Achilles (*Il.* 18.590-606) and the Chorus are dancing in one as they sing! The epithet (καλλίχορος) expresses the Chorus' pride in Athens' cultural splendour and also their hope that the city's peace remain undisturbed by Argive attack (cf. 379-80).

360-1 you are a fool: a remarkably direct rebuke, which throws the Herald's imputation of Athenian foolishness (147-52) back in his face. **Argos' ruler:** lit. 'in Argos'; the bare locative dative (here placed between article and noun) is a poetic usage: cf. Smyth §1531, K-G i. 441. Richard Seaford, 'The Social Function of Attic Tragedy: A Response to Jasper Griffin', *CQ* 50 (2000) 30-44, p. 34 points out that the word τύραννος had negative connotations in fifth-century Athens, where 'democracy had been created out of the overthrow of an oppressive tyranny'. But although this is not always so in tragedy (especially in Aesch.; cf. Fraenkel on *Ag.* 828), the word's negative charge is felt here. **the son of Sthenelus:** Sthenelus was son of Perseus and father of Eury. (cf. *Il.* 19.123). He seems to have been a rival of Heracles' father Amphitryon (cf. Eur. *Alcmene* fr. 89N^2), prefiguring the hostility of Eury. against Heracles.

362 You came ...: ὃς picks up σὺ (360), referring to the Herald; for the relative pronoun connecting lyric stanzas in this way, cf. e.g. *Bacch.* 88, 997. **to another city:** i.e. Athens; cf. 355n.

363 not at all inferior to Argos: the Herald's treatment of the suppliants is a challenge to Athens' power as well as its independence; cf. 242-6, 262-3.

365-6 refugees in my land: ἄντομαι is regularly used of supplication ('I beseech', with acc.), e.g. *Suppl.* 279. Pearson explains the genitive ἐμᾶς χθονὸς as 'due to the analogy of ἀντάω ['I meet with']'. L's ἀντεχομένους gives acceptable sense ('clinging to my land') but is unmetrical. **though you are a foreigner:** cf. 355n.

367 you try to drag away: a conative present, cf. 139-40n.

368 any just claim: cf. 138n.

369-70 How could such things be right ...?: cf. Owen on *Ion* 528 'ποῦ is satirical, as commonly, expressing greater incredulity than πῶς.' **in the judgement of sensible men:** for παρά with dat. in this sense, cf. 201, 881. The Athenians' sound judgement is contrasted with Eury.'s foolishness (360, 372).

371-2 for the idea 'peace is preferable, but if war begins...', cf. *Tro.* 400-2. For peace as utopia in Eur. and earlier poets, see Kannicht on *Hel.* 1151-64; for praise of peace in a variety of genres, cf. Y. Garlan, 'War and Peace', in J.-P. Vernant (ed.) *The Greeks*, trans. C. Lambert and T. L. Fagan (Chicago, 1995) 53-85, p. 55. Here, although the the Chorus say they enjoy peace, they have no doubt that the war they are about to fight is a just one (368).

372-80 the Chorus, having spoken of Eury. in the third person (360-1), now address him directly to remind him of Athens' military strength.

372 I say to you: Canter's σοὶ δ' is preferable to L's σὺ δ'. As Wilkins notes, σὺ δ' 'leaves λέγω in an awkward parenthesis'. Moreover, σοὶ δ' is appropriate to the Chorus' tone of warning (cf. *Hec.* 1232, adduced by Diggle in his apparatus), as well as being 'the usual idiom (*GP* 189) for a changed direction of address' (Willink on *Or.* 622).

376 bronze-covered shield: such a shield was the hallmark of the hoplite panoply, and was widely known as the 'Argive' shield (cf. Snodgrass (Intro. n. 15) 108). The Chorus assert that Athens has such armour too - and knows how to use it. At the time of the play's production many Athenians were frustrated by Pericles' strategy of avoiding hand-to-hand conflict and relying on Athens' sea power instead (cf. Thuc. 2.21.3, Garlan (371-2n.) 60-1). Here the Chorus face the threat of pitched battle defiantly. For the play's mixture of contemporary and heroic forms of fighting (i.e. duels between individual warriors), see 800-3n.

379-80 the city that abounds in graces: for εὖ ἔχω with gen. (χαρίτων) in the sense 'to be well off for something', cf. *Hipp.* 462. The Chorus again portray Athens as a city full of beauty and elegance (cf. 359, *Med.* 824-45, *Ion* 184-9) which the Argives should leave undisturbed.

381-607: Scene Three (Second *Epeisodion*): Iolaus, Demophon, Maiden.

The Hcld. have succeeded in their supplication, but the re-entry of Dem. (probably without Acamas, since he is not mentioned) introduces a dilemma that throws into question the whole action of the play so far. Eur. is particularly fond of such unexpected reversals, and an aesthetic of discontinuity and surprise is fundamental to his work: cf. W. Allan, *The Andromache and Euripidean Tragedy* (Oxford, 2000) 40-2, 82-5, Intro. §2(b). Unfortunately, the purpose of the countermovement here has often been obscured, as critics disputed whether the scene was interpolated due to the popularity of Eur.'s other sacrifice scenes (McLean

(1934) 208-12) or was inserted later (and clumsily) by Euripides himself 'to help the play achieve the tragic effect which it otherwise entirely lacks' (Schmitt (1921) 2): cf. Intro. §2(a).

The scene is certainly self-contained (there is, for example, no more mention of Heracles' daughter after her exit at 601; contrast *Hec.* 508-618, *Phoen.* 1090-2), but this is deliberate, not a sign of faulty construction: see 630-747, 819-22nn. As Burian (1977) 8 n. 17 observes, 'Euripides has postponed the tragic crisis from the initial encounter of suppliants and king (as in Aesch. *Supp.*) to an episode following their acceptance by him', and it is in response to this crisis that the daughter of Heracles makes her appearance. (Once the crisis is resolved, she disappears from the play.) Her decision to give up her life is significant in several ways: (1) she proves in action the nobility of the Hcld. as a whole (cf. 296-303, 537-8, 553-4, 626-7); (2) her death secures victory for Athens as well as the Hcld. (cf. 402) and so confirms the bond between them; and (3) perhaps most importantly, her decision transforms the Hcld. from passive recipients of Athenian protection into active agents of their own salvation (cf. 420-1, 497, 506). As a result Athens' support for them is vindicated, and Heracles' daughter pays back the favour (*charis*) that the Hcld. owe to Athens (cf. 310ff., 437-8, 503-6, 517-19).

Eur. explored the motivation and impact of voluntary self-sacrifice in various myths (contrast Iphigenia's *involuntary* death as a sacrificial victim in Aesch. *Ag.*). This is probably the earliest surviving example of such a scene (cf. Wilkins (1990b) 191 n. 2), and in it Eur. introduces many of the motifs that characterize his later sacrifice plays, *Hec.*, *Phoen.*, *Erechth.*, and *IA*: cf. 474-607n. Self-sacrifice makes for powerful theatre, but there is also a critical and provocative aspect to these scenes, and a tragic reflection on the waste of youth, especially in the deaths of Polyxena, Menoeceus, and Iphigenia. Such acts of human sacrifice represent a violation of sacrificial norms (cf. 408-9n.), which marks the tragic decision facing the characters. In the *Hcld.* the self-sacrifice of Heracles' daughter has an undoubtedly positive impact for both the Hcld. and Athens, but this is shockingly undermined by the play's closing scene (cf. 474-607, 928-1055nn.).

381-2 it is a convention of tragic stagecraft that the entering character usually speaks first. When this does not happen, it is often because 'the speaking actor is of superior status' (Taplin (1977) 397), but this is not the case with Iol. Instead, as Mastronarde (1979) 22 n. 16 observes, it is 'reluctance on the part of the newcomer' that prevents Dem. from beginning the dialogue. **with worry in your eyes:** Iol.'s question (a kind of 'built-in' stage-direction) makes Dem.'s reluctance immediately clear to the audience. Eyes were considered powerful channels of emotion, especially of desire (e.g. Sappho fr. 31, *Ag.* 741-2), but also (as here) of anxiety (cf. 633, *Aj.* 139-40). Iol. addresses five questions to Dem. in three lines (381-3) and opens the scene on a note of tension and foreboding.

384 **prove the herald's words false:** rather than 'you will not speak false words as a herald'. For ψεύδω meaning 'prove false', cf. *Ant.* 389.

385 **who has enjoyed good fortune before:** cf. Zuntz 106 'Tyrwhitt's conjecture τὰ πρόσθεν ὤν for τὰ πρὸς θεῶν is, in my view, one of the most brilliant ever made in this play'. Iol. is certainly more likely to stress Eury.'s good fortune than his favour with the gods. Eury.'s good luck eventually runs out: cf. 862-3, 746-7, 939-40.

386 **with no meek thoughts:** οὐ σμικρὸν [= μέγα] φρονῶν, cf. 933, *Aj.* 1120. καὶ μάλα intensifies the litotes (cf. *GP* 317).

387-8 **let me tell you:** cf. LSJ *s.v.* τοι 'ethical dative of σύ ... A particle ... implying a real or imagined audience'. **Zeus ... proud:** cf. Aesch. *Pers.* 827-8 Ζεύς τοι κολαστὴς τῶν

ὑπερκόμπων (–κόπων Blomfield) ἄγαν / φρονημάτων ἔπεστιν ('For Zeus stands over and punishes thoughts that are over-proud'). The similarlity led Schroeder to suggest ὑπερκόπων for ὑπερφρόνων here, but is it not more likely that Eur. would seek to alter Aesch.'s phrasing slightly? Wilkins' excellent note outlines the positive (and poetic) features of the text as it stands, ending 'Here, the φρήν of Eurystheus and the Argives is emphasized, picking up the similar sentiment in the ode at 360, 370, 372.' For Zeus' role in Eury.'s defeat, cf. 766-9, 851, 867, 869.

389 **The Argive army ... king:** Dem.'s opening words confirm Iol.'s expectations (384, cf. 275-8). Eury. has brought his army eastwards from the Megarian border (278-9) into Attica, and they are now stationed at some unspecified point overlooking the plain of Marathon (393-5).

390-2 Dem.'s insistence on first-hand experience and tactical observation show both his skill as a general and his personal concern for the safety of his people. The Athenians elected ten generals (*strategoi*) each year and will have appreciated such qualities. **through the eyes of messengers:** for the dative, cf. Pearson 'By the use of ἀγγέλοισι instead of δι' ἀγγέλων the messengers are treated as instruments of vision'; cf. Bond on *Her.* 1380, Smyth §1507 (b), K-G i. 436.

394 **a rocky brow:** the metaphorical sense of ὀφρῦς ('brow', 'eyebrow') is rather rare (cf. Edwards on *Il.* 20.151), but used by Hdt. 4.181, 5.92. Wilkins notes that this is its only appearance in surviving tragedy.

395 **merely my opinion:** δή intensifies the word before it. For δόκησις as mere 'appearance', cf. 745-6, Kannicht on *Hel.* 119.

396 **by what route:** ὁδῶι is understood with ποίαι (πῆι is the usual word). **from there to our borders:** I translate the conjecture τοὐνθένδ' ὅροις, originally made in part by F. H. Bothe in 1823 (see Diggle 519). Kovacs (Loeb) translates Willink's τοσόνδ' ὅροις ('by what route he should bring *so great* an army *within the borders* of our land'), but mention of Eury.'s starting point ('from there', i.e. from the edge of the plain) follows more naturally from 393-4.

399-401 Dem.'s preparations involve two different kinds of sacrifice: animal victims are prepared on the battlefield (399-400), while seers perform divinatory sacrifices in the city (401). These correspond to the *sphagia* and *hiera* described by Pritchett (340n.).

399-400 pre-battle *sphagia* differed from regular sacrifice in so far as a fire and altar were not required and the flesh of the victim was not eaten: see M. H. Jameson, 'Sacrifice before Battle', in V. D. Hanson (ed.), *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience* (London, 1991) 197-227, p. 201. (For humorous parody of such offerings, cf. Ar. *Lys.* 204, where τὰ σφάγια δέξαι is used of a 'sacrificed' jar of wine.) **stand ready:** the victims are prepared so that they can be slaughtered as soon as the fighting begins: cf. 673, 819-22, Burkert (1985) 60 'The quasi-harmless and manageable slaughter is a premonitory anticipation of the battle and its unforeseeable dangers; it is a beginning.' **for the gods:** the gods remain anonymous: cf. Wilkins 103 'the recipients of military σφάγια are often not specified'. As Diggle 224 notes, 'The vague reference ... provides a suitable contrast with the specific reference to [the daughter of] Demeter which is to follow [408-9].'

401 **the city is filled with the sacrifices:** these are the offerings announced by Dem. at 340. For the intransitive verb used as a passive (θυηπολέω = 'I perform sacrifices'), cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* 1433-5, Smyth §1749.

403-9 Dem.'s recourse to divination by oracles is quite natural given the danger facing the city. Aristophanes and Thucydides both point to the abuse of oracles for political or personal ends in the fifth century (cf. D. M. MacDowell, *Aristophanes and Athens* (Oxford, 1995) 89-90, 194-6, Hornblower on Thuc. 3.104.1) but there is no hint here, *pace* Spranger (1925) 122-3, that Dem. has invented (cf. Hdt. 7.6.3) or distorted these oracles in order to avoid his obligation to fight for the Hcld. Similarly, Hall (Intro. n. 7) 120 comments 'It is also implied that he is too susceptible to the advice of oracle-tellers', but Dem., for all his faults (cf. 271-3n.), is not being unduly credulous: he has no reason to doubt the diviners' unanimous judgement, appalling though it is.

403 **chanters:** many oracles were composed in verse (especially in dactylic hexameter) and would be chanted rather than spoken. For the chanting of oracles in Athens at the start of the Peloponnesian War, see Thuc. 2.8.2.; and for Thuc.'s sceptical view of wartime prophecy, cf. 2.54.

404 **both public and secret matters:** Dem.'s thorough questioning once again marks his concern: cf. 390-2n.

405 Wilamowitz (1882b) 352 n. 1 deleted this line, noting that λόγια is otherwise unknown in tragedy. Cf. Diggle 223 'The motive for interpolation is clear: the neuters in 404 invited an explanatory noun.'

408-9 The command to sacrifice a maiden of noble birth to the daughter of Demeter represents an unexpected and dreadful reversal of fortune for both the Hcld. and Athens (cf. 381-607n.). The need for human sacrifice, which is disturbing in psychological as well as ritual terms, creates a powerful sense of crisis. To appreciate its impact on a fifth-century audience, and also its function within the play, it may be helpful to consider the main features of the oracles' demand separately.

(i) **Human sacrifice.** The sacrifice of animals both in the city and on the battlefield was a regular part of military preparation in the fifth century. By contrast, human sacrifice took place only in myth or in accounts of barbarian savagery. Scattered evidence suggests that human sacrifice may however have been performed in early Greece (cf. Burkert (1985) 27, 31, 37, O'Connor-Visser (1987) 211-32, and D. D. Hughes, *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (London, 1991) esp. 199-202, on early peak sanctuaries, Bronze Age Crete, and the Linear B tablets), but as A. Henrichs points out ('Human Sacrifice in Greek Religion: Three Case Studies', in O. Reverdin and J. Rudhardt (eds.), *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité* (Entretiens Hardt 27, Geneva, 1981) 195-235, p. 195), human sacrifice 'existed nowhere [in Greece] as a regular cultic institution'.

In his excellent study Henrichs shows that (p. 208) 'the only case of human sacrifice known from 5th century Athens' (i.e., Themistocles' sacrifice of three well-born Persian prisoners before the battle of Salamis) is probably a later fabrication (cf. esp. 223-4, Hughes (op. cit.) 107-15). But this example is interesting nevertheless because it illustrates the common (perhaps universal) pattern of a ritual killing which is intended to avert catastrophe. As W. Burkert, *Creation of the Sacred: Tracks of Biology in Early Religions* (Cambridge, Mass., 1996) 54 observes, 'The conviction that a threat to human life can only be averted by offering another human being is a form of logic that can arise everywhere.' Since human sacrifice is generally a response to circumstances of exceptional crisis, it is not surpising that it should be found in situations where battle is

imminent. In the *Hcld.*, as in *Phoen.* and *Erechth.*, the sacrifice is performed to ensure a military victory (cf. *IA*).

However, if human sacrifice is seen as a barbarian practice (cf. *IT* 389-91), and if, according to the Greek sources, 'the practice of human sacrifice characterizes the "bad guys"' (Henrichs op. cit. 215 n. 1), what does it mean for Athenians to perform such a sacrifice? Significantly, Eur. diverts such problems by presenting the sacrifice as *voluntary*. Thus the Athenians can believe that they are doing nothing barbaric because Heracles' daughter goes to her death willingly. Eur. was the first to introduce the motif of voluntary sacrifice into the Iphigenia myth (*IA*), and he was clearly very interested in the idea, returning to it several times. Here, in his first surviving self-sacrifice scene, Eur. presents a human sacrifice in times of military crisis, but instead of focussing on the dilemma of the sacrificer (cf. *Ag.*), he concentrates our attention on the more intriguing response of the sacrificial volunteer herself, presenting her motivations and her aims in their own right.

(ii) Female victims. It is a striking feature of the myths of pre-battle self-sacrifice that they mainly concern young women. Their willingness to die to ensure victory is a female counterpart to the sacrifice of male warriors in the battle itself. J. Larson (Intro. n. 28) 101 has noted that stories of virgin sacrifice are especially prominent in Attica and Boeotia. She discusses (102-3) five examples, three of which come from Attica: the sacrifice of the daughters of Erechtheus (also known as the Hyacinthides), the suicide of Aglauros (daughter of Cecrops), and the sacrifice of the daughters of Leos (one of the ten eponymous Attic heroes).

In the context of civic exhortation such female acts of self-sacrifice were extremely useful. As is often noted, in Attic oratory the self-sacrifice of young women is repeatedly held up to Athenian men as an ideal of courageous patriotism. Here, sexual rivalry is used to further the good of the polis. Burkert (Intro. n. 85) 75 argues that there is a sexual aspect to the pre-battle sacrifice itself: the death of a virgin fuels the warriors' violence by creating a situation where 'anxiety and abandonment are superseded by sexual rivalry and aggression. The other side, instead of being a somewhat misty impersonation of peril or evil, becomes a greedy oppressor who is to be overthrown.' In the *Hcld.* this aggression is turned against the Argives, who have created the crisis in which an innocent young woman must die.

However, the sexualization of killing or the connection between the blood of sacrifice and menstruation (cf. R. Osborne, 'Women and Sacrifice in Classical Greece' *CQ* 43 (1993) 392-405, p. 396) cannot account for the sacrifice of young men like Megareus in Soph. *Ant.* or Menoeceus in Eur. *Phoen.* Nevertheless, even without the sexual element, the death of young royal sons to save the city (Thebes) is a powerful symbol of civic crisis (cf. (iv) below). And although these male figures have no sanctuaries or rites in classical Greek religion, their deaths are modelled on those of royal daughters who do.

(iii) Noble victims. As Henrichs (op. cit. 217) observes of actual historical practice, 'Animal victims for public sacrifice were distinguished by high breeding'. Similarly, in myth, the humans who voluntarily sacrifice themselves for the good of their city or family are invariably well-born.

(iv) Young victims. Whether male or female, the human victims of myth are all distinguished by their youth. Henrichs (op. cit. 233) notes that the young are 'usually

made to die in the public interest, to save the fathers and mothers who controlled and perpetuated the polis society'. By contrast, the daughter of Heracles dies on behalf of her siblings and to ensure that they have an opportunity to regain their ancestral city. She may also share in death the kourotrophic function (of protecting young children) which her father Heracles had in Athens (cf. 581-3n.). Eur.'s stress on the waste of young lives, prominent in *Phoen.* and *IA* in particular, has been denied in the case of the *Hcld.*, but there is a critical element to the sacrifice here as well (cf. 474-607n.).

(v) Kore. Henrichs (op. cit. 213 n. 3) remarks 'Most types of human sacrifice have no divine recipient' (compare the anonymity of the gods in the pre-battle *sphagia*: 399-400n.). Why then does Eur. name the divine recipient in each of his self-sacrifice plays? The request of a specific god has a double effect: it convinces the victim that the ultimate sacrifice is necessary, and guarantees that his or her self-sacrifice will achieve its purpose.

In other plays the recipient is relevant to the wider action: Achilles (a dead man) in *Hec.*, Ares and Earth in *Phoen.*, Artemis in *IA*. What relevance does Kore have for the *Hcld.*? Larson (Intro. n. 28) 107 notes that in the case of Heracles' daughter 'there is no element of wrath or expiation' as in the Artemis-Iphigenia myth, and she goes on 'The concept of a sacrifice to Persephone is simply the theistic expression of the notion that death is required as the price of the desired outcome.' However, there are signs that the choice of Kore is intended to evoke certain associations. Firstly, she is referred to in the play exclusively as 'the daughter of Demeter' (408-9, 490, 601) rather than Persephone. Although she is never named, Kore's human victim stresses her own duty as a daughter of Heracles (509, 513, 563). Secondly, Kore was revered in cult as a protector of children: here a child is sacrificed to her in order to save others. Finally, there is a parallel between goddess and victim that is specific to their age and sex: Kore's rape by Hades deprived her of a girl's normal transition to adulthood. As Heracles' daughter prepares to die, she points to her own loss of marriage and sexual experience (579-80, 591-2).

Offerings to Demeter and Kore were made at Marathon (*IG* II^2 1358 B 43-4) and both goddesses were worshipped widely throughout the Attic countryside (cf. *OC* 681-5), especially at Eleusis. Demeter and Kore are also invoked as protectors of Athens in an anonymous party song (*PMG* 885). So Athenians will have associated Kore not only with death but also with the safety of Athens, making her an appropriate recipient for a sacrifice that will ensure the defeat of Athens' enemies (compare her role as the recipient of Athenian victims in Eur. *Erechth.*). Fisher (17-18n.) 426 n. 72 remarks 'I do not see that some disturbing sense of the unfairness of the goddess is excluded', but there is no explicit criticism of the sacrifice to Kore, which is included, as Conacher (1967) 115 saw, 'for the sake of the heroic response which it is to elicit, and for the significant part which this response plays in the [*charis*] theme as a whole.' The negative impact of the sacrifice emerges only in the aftermath of the battle whose outcome it is intended to secure: cf. 474-607n.

408 to sacrifice (σφάξαι): a strong word, meaning to cut the throat (like a sacrificial animal). The language of sacrifice is often used of killing in tragedy to express the perversion of social norms (cf. the classic discussion of W. Burkert, 'Greek Tragedy and Sacrificial Ritual', *GRBS* 7 (1966) 87-121. esp. 116-20; also R. Seaford, 'Homeric and Tragic Sacrifice', *TAPA* 119 (1989) 87-95, pp. 87-8). Here the (literal) sacrifice involves

a human victim, making it particularly shocking, and marking the unexpected crisis facing both the Hcld. and Athens.

402 Diggle 222-4 argues convincingly for the transposition of this line. The exceptional sacrifice of a virgin to Kore (408-9) seems more likely to ensure 'the rout of the enemy and salvation for the city' than are the customary pre-battle offerings (399-401). Diggle also conjectures the accusative σωτηρίαν in apposition to 408-9 (cf. 72); while symmetry of expression perhaps requires the noun, the neuter pl. adj. (σωτήρια) is not impossible.

410 **eager to help:** for the hint of futility in προθυμία, cf. Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 588-9.

411-14 Dem. explains his dilemma as a democratic king, concerned as much for his citizens' children as his own.

413-14 love for one's children is a recurrent appeal in plays where their lives are at risk, whether from infanticide (*Med.* 816, *Her.* 975-6, 988-9) or human sacrifice (*Phoen.* 965-6, *IA* 1256).

413 **against his will... by choice:** the enjambment of ἄκοντα gives emphasis, while the juxtaposition of ἄκονθ' ἑκών is a Euripidean mannerism; cf. 531, *Andr.* 357, *Phoen.* 630.

415-18 the citizens split into opposing groups: some think Dem.'s conduct just and others think it foolish, corresponding to the opposed viewpoints of Iol. and the Herald (cf. 147, 189-91).

415 the repeated ἄν is vivid and emphatic; cf. *Alc.* 96-7, *Hipp.* 495-6, *Andr.* 302-3, 934-5, *Her.* 233-4, Smyth §1765 (b).

418-19 the fear of civil war was an enduring feature of Athenian politics, which is here introduced into the world of heroic monarchy (cf. 236-52n., *Eum.* 858-66, 976-87). For the effects of *stasis* in general, see Thuc. 3.82-3. There will have been much unease in Athens *c.* 430 about the loss of young lives. One of the functions of funerary speeches (e.g. Thuc. 2.35-46) is to justify such sacrifice to the families of the dead.

419 **will break out** (ἐξαρτύεται)**:** present for future, expressing vividness and animation; cf. 159, Goodwin §32.

421 Dem. does not abandon the suppliants but looks for a common solution. Heracles' daughter responds to his loyalty and dies for the sake of Athens as well as her family (cf. 503-6, 622).

422 **conflict with the citizens:** fut. pass. of διαβάλλω ('I set at variance'); cf. *Hec.* 863, *Phil.* 582.

423-4 Dem. presents Athenian monarchy as tempered by justice and reciprocity, while implying that barbarian rulers exercise 'tyranny' in the pejorative sense. Contrast the Thucydidean Pericles' frank assessment of Athenian rule in 430 (see 153-4n.), which is repeated by Cleon in the Mytilenean Debate of 427: 'your empire is a tyranny' (Thuc. 3.37.2).

425-6 The Chorus-leader is baffled by the unexpected setback to Athens' offer of assistance. ἀλλ' ἦ ('but can it be that ...?') suits the Chorus-leader's tone of surprise and incredulity: cf. *GP* 27.

427-60 Having secured Athens' protection, Iol. must now respond to the unexpected demand for human sacrifice. He excuses Dem.'s unwillingness to kill an Athenian child (435-8) before

sinking into despair (439-50) and offering to hand himself over to Eury. (453-8). Iol.'s death would in fact be useless because it is the children Eury. wants to kill (cf. 465-70), but his offer prepares for the selflessness and family concern of Heracles' daughter.

427-32 Since similes in Greek poetry typically draw on everyday experience, the sea is a popular subject, e.g. *Andr.* 748-9, 891-2, *Ag.* 899, *Cho.* 201-3. Storms at sea feature in several Homeric similes, some of them extremely moving (cf. *Od.* 23.231-40).

433-4 The sudden apostrophe of hope is pathetic (cf. 169). It also has a 'semi-personifying effect' (Willink on *Or.* 126). **before:** the contrast between past and present in τότ' (cf. Diggle 492 with n. 10) highlights the deceptiveness of hope.

435-8 Iol. exonerates Dem. for his refusal to compel the sacrifice of an Athenian maiden. The Athenians are clearly sensitive to the possibility that people will think they have abandoned the suppliants: cf. 461-3.

435 **For:** Pearson explains the connection of thought: 'it is hope which has betrayed me, for Demophon cannot be blamed.'

436 **I can accept:** for ἔχω + inf. meaning 'I am able to', cf. 485, 669, *Med.* 465.

437 for emphatic εἰ δή (here stressing θεοῖσι), cf. 418, 592, 739, *GP* 223-4. Hermann's εἰ <δὲ> θεοῖσι δή avoids the puzzling asyndeton.

438 **to you:** having gestured to Dem. in 435 (τοῦδ'), Iol. now addresses him directly. For the bond of *charis* between Athens and the Hcld., cf. 214-22, 236nn.

440-2 Iol. repeats the rhetoric of the opening suppliant action: **not garlanded:** cf. 71, 124; **be handed over:** cf. 97, 221, 453. The repeated phrases suggest that the demand for human sacrifice has totally undone the Hcld.'s earlier supplication.

441 **land ... protection:** lit. 'what protection of a land' (cf. 46); ποῖον is transferred by hypallage from γαίας to ἔρκος.

443ff. Iol.'s disregard for his own survival (κἀμοῦ μέν) contrasts with his grief at the children's fate (ὑμᾶς δέ). Since μέλει usually takes a dative, Stephanus' κἀμοί is attractive.

444 the Greeks were extremely candid about the pleasure felt at the death of an enemy: see Dover (1974) 183-4. Iol.'s fear of being shamed in this way is typical of the heroic mentality of tragedy (cf. *Med.* 383, Soph. *El.* 1152-3, *Aj.* 469).

446 Iol. reminds the audience once again of Alc.'s presence within the temple (cf. 41-3, 210-11), preparing for her animated entrance in the next scene (646ff.).

447 **unfortunate ... in your long life:** for the causal gen. (here following an adjective), cf. 232n. As with Iol., the stress on Alc.'s miserable old age is pathetic in its own right, while also highlighting the vulnerability of the Hcld.

449 **It was fated, fated:** as Barrett notes (on *Hipp.* 41) χρή tends to stress 'an accordance with the divine order'. So here Iol. infers from the oracles' demand that the Hcld. are destined not to be saved. (Anadiplosis of verbs is particularly characteristic of Eur.'s later *lyrics* (cf. Diggle 388-90); here it suggests Iol.'s resignation at the inevitability of fate.)

450 **die shamefully:** cf. Cairns (1993) 279 n. 51 'the taking of the suppliant by force may be *aischron* for the suppliant himself, as well as for his protector.'

451 Iol. again addresses Dem. (cf. 438n.). His sudden idea is marked by lively expression, lit. 'but you know what you must help me do': cf. Stevens (1976) 36, Renehan (75-6n.) 5 'The aorist imperative with οἶσθ' ὅ is a common construction in the Attic dramatists but

is apparently peculiar to them.' Kannicht on *Hel.* 315 has a good note on the form's origins and colloquial effect.

454 I pray: probably an 'ethic' dative, given that μοι is enclitic, rather than 'let the children be saved *by me*'.

455 I must not cling to my own life: φιλοψυχία is a weakness often disavowed by self-sacrificers: cf. 518n.

456-8 for Eury.'s *hybris*, cf. 17-18n. **a crass man:** Eur. often uses σκαιός (and ἀμαθής, cf. 459) of people who are 'morally deficient, lacking in finer feelings, devoid of αἰδώς' (Bond on *Her.* 283); cf. 460.

458-60 Iol. ends his speech with a general reflection (cf. 1-11n.). His preference for a 'wise' enemy (i.e., one who treats his defeated opponents decently) is shockingly denied by Alc. herself in the closing scene: cf. esp. 1022-5.

461-3 The Chorus-leader fears that Athens may be blamed for betraying its religious duty to the suppliants. Both the situation and the potential accusation clearly threaten to undermine the positive impact of the traditional myth, where Athens' intervention is decisive, since here the Athenian offer of protection is not enough to ensure the Hcld.'s safety. Reassuringly, however, Iol. shows no sign of blaming Athens for the breakdown in their supplication: cf. 435-8.

464-73 Dem. rejects Iol.'s desperate attempt to save the Hcld. and reminds him that the oracles' demand remains unanswered. Dem.'s tone is urgent and he makes it clear that the situation is critical (cf. 472 'I am helpless').

464 noble but impossible: Hecuba, Andromache and Creon also volunteer to die in place of their children, but without success (*Hec.* 386-8, *Andr.* 404-12, *Phoen.* 968-9).

466-7 the death of an old man: cf. *Hec.* 389-90, where Hecuba's offer is rejected (in the context of maiden sacrifice) because she is old.

468-70 Heroic ethics dictated that sons should avenge the wrongs done to their forebears. In the *El.*, Aegisthus forces Electra to marry a peasant-farmer so that her sons will be 'weak' (i.e. socially insignificant) and so less likely to take revenge for the murder of Agamemnon (*El.* 266-9).

470 Eurystheus must guard against all this: Dem. hardly intends to justify Eury.'s actions on these grounds (Eury. does this himself: 1005-8). However, by drawing attention to the fact that Eury. is compelled to kill the Hcld., Dem. acknowledges Eury.'s cruelty to Heracles and stresses his determination to invade Attica.

472-3 helpless ... and full of fear: Dem.'s admission of powerlessness emphasizes the need for a new solution, which is swiftly yet surpisingly provided by the entry of Heracles' daughter.

474-607 a young woman enters from the temple of Zeus Agoraios (cf. ἔξοδος 474). Though her entry is unnanounced (474n.), the audience will presume her to be one of the daughters of Heracles whom Alc. has been protecting inside the temple (cf. 41-3). She is called Macaria in some ancient sources and in L, but is never named in the play (cf. the three daughters of Erechtheus), hence Elmsley's change to 'Maiden' in the text. On the significance of the name Macaria (and its omission), see Intro. §1(f). Her anonymity recalls the anonymous (but glorious) war dead of Attic funeral orations: like them her sacrifice protects an entire city.

Eur. shows a remarkable fascination with the theme of self-sacrifice. It is variously explored in six extant plays (*Alc.*, *Hcld.*, *Hec.*, *Suppl.*, *Phoen.*, *IA*) and in at least three others

now largely lost (*Protesilaus*, *Erechth.*, *Phrixus B*). The *Hcld.*, however, is the first to present a voluntary sacrifice that is intended to save family and city, and it is 'probably the prototype' (Wilkins xx) for the five other known examples of such a scene (*Hec.*, *Phoen.*, *IA* (where a whole nation is saved), *Erechth.*, *Phrixus B*). Eur. dramatizes the background to each sacrifice, and its impact, in different ways. Regardless of whether Eur. invented the self-sacrifice of Heracles' daughter or inherited it from the mythic tradition (cf. Intro. §1(f)), it is certainly wrong to claim, as Loraux does (Intro. n. 110) 108, that the sacrifice here serves 'no useful purpose'. In fact it has a crucial role in the development of the plot (cf. Strohm (1957) 52), saving Athens from defeat and turning the Hcld. from passive to active participants in their own rescue. This is underlined by the fact that unlike Polyxena, Menoeceus, Iphigenia and the daughter of Erechtheus, the daughter of Heracles is not designated specifically as the sacrificial victim; any girl (even an Athenian) would do, yet salvation comes from within the family of Heracles.

In the *Hec.*, *Phoen.*, and *IA* the selfless death of the young has a critical impact (cf. 408-9 (iv) n.). Polyxena and Iphigenia, for example, die just like warriors in their courage and surpass the failed male heroes who surround them. In these plays the crisis of sacrifice reflects a wider crisis in heroic society. Is there a similarly critical or ironic edge to the self-sacrifice in the *Hcld.*? Wilkins (1990b) 189 has argued most vehemently against such an ironic interpretation of both the *Hcld.* and *Erechth.* because it demands 'a radical reversal in the presentation of Athens, more abrupt and curtly treated than anywhere else in Euripides'. However, the fact that a play is set in Athens or Attica does not mean it has to a follow a patriotic line throughout. Athens' decision to support Alc. is indeed abrupt, but it is all the more effective for being so surprising. The self-sacrifice of Heracles' daughter has a wholly positive effect in this scene, and it is not mentioned again (cf. 630-747n.). Nevertheless, while she undoubtedly dies for a good cause, her sacrifice throws a critical light on the subsequent conduct of Alc. (and Athens too, insofar as it condones her revenge).

474 Entries in Eur. (and Soph.) are usually announced. As a result, R. Hamilton, 'Announced Entrances in Greek Tragedy', *HSCP* 82 (1982) 63-82, 67 n. 13, places this particular one in the category of 'unannounced surprise'.

474-7 the young woman begins by addressing the Chorus and Dem. directly ('Strangers'), apologizing for 'the boldness of her uninvited appearance in public' (Mastronarde (1979) 27). **because of my coming out here:** for the causal dative (ἐξόδοις ἐμαῖς), cf. 701, *Andr.* 157, *Suppl.* 1042, Willink on *Or.* 39-40, Smyth §1517. **the best thing for a woman:** tragedy (like most Greek literature, which was almost entirely written by men) contains numerous remarks about the proper role of women. An emphasis on silence, modesty, and staying indoors is typical of (male-generated) Greek thought (cf. 700-1n.), and here it is meant to underline the 'respectability' of the speaker. L. McClure, *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama* (Princeton, 1999) 25 argues that 'Macaria's speech functions ambiguously: it simultaneously proclaims the moral authority entailed by her voluntary act of sacrifice and disavows the authority of her speech ... She is represented as reinforcing Athenian gender ideology regarding speech even as she publicly makes her case before men.' However, the δέ in 478 is significant: the Maiden is speaking out despite custom and actually insists on the appropriateness (and authority) of her speech. Of course, dramatic convention meant that a female character did not have to apologize every time for her presence outside (i.e. on stage)! Therefore, when a character does so (as here), she is making a particular point (see 479-

80). For Athenian women in relation to their houses, cf. S. Blundell, *Women in Ancient Greece* (London, 1995) 138-44.

478-9 hearing your lamentations: Strohm (1957) 51 thought poorly of the 'hasty' entry of Heracles' daughter, but it follows the example of the Chorus (73-4) and Dem. (121, 126) in being motivated by on-stage cries of distress (the tragic *boê*). One should not confuse an unexpected entry with a hasty one. In fact, the daughter's entry from the temple is composed and deliberate, unlike that of Alc., who, summoned by Iol., enters in a panic and mistakes Iol.'s cry of delight (643) for one of danger (646-8).

479 not appointed to represent the family: lit. 'to act as ambassador for the family'. The language stresses that her role is unofficial and that she has come forward of her own free will. More subtly, the point may be that she is not taking the role of πρεσβύς ('old man', i.e. Iol. himself), who is here, and failing.

480 a fitting person: πως = 'in some way', which the next clause goes on to explain ('because I am ...'), with δέ being equivalent to γάρ.

482 For μή + indicative expressing anxiety or suspicion (in indirect questions), cf. Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 93-4, Goodwin §269, K-G ii. 394-5.

483 troubling: lit. 'is biting [or stinging] your heart'; cf. West on Hes. *Theog.* 567; also R. Padel, *In and Out of the Mind: Greek Images of the Tragic Self* (Princeton, 1992) 21-3 on *phrenes* in Homer and tragedy.

484 most among the children: Iol.'s μάλιστα ... τέκνων nicely answers the Maiden's μάλιστ' ἀδελφῶν ... πέρι (481).

484-97 Iol. summarizes events so far for the new character, a technique particularly appropriate to the arrival of the saviour in suppliant plays; cf. *Andr.* 559-76 (Andromache informs the newly-arrived Peleus), *Her.* 534-61 (dialogue between Megara and Heracles). He repeats many of the phrases that Dem. had used to announce the sacrifice, but he is much more explicit about Dem.'s position (the Hcld. face expulsion unless a human sacrifice is found), providing the cue for the Maiden's offer to die on their behalf.

485 I can justly praise: cf. 436n.

486 our course: Iol. returns to the nautical imagery of 427-32; cf. *Her.* 95-6, where Amphitryon hopes the suppliants will find a 'favouring course' (οὔριος δρόμος) to good fortune. L. has δόμος, but the sea metaphor suits Iol., and δρόμος goes better with μεθέστηκ'. Scribes often confuse the two words: cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* 1671 (p. 435 n. 30).

487 a helpless state: Iol. picks up Dem.'s alarming confession of ἀμηχανία (472) and emphasizes the suppliants' desperate predicament.

489-90 not a bull or a calf but a virgin: Iol. repeats Dem.'s report of Kore's demand (408-9), but by specifying the avoidance of normal animal victims he puts even more stress on the human sacrifice. κελεύειν μητρός L: the scribal error may be explained by the reminiscence of 408-9.

491 if we are to survive and this city too: for anaphora with μέν ... δέ, cf. 494, *GP* 370. Double χρή: cf. 449n. As Diggle 223 points out, the sequence of thought here (489-91) supports the transposition of 402 to follow 408-9.

492 at a loss (ἀμηχανοῦμεν): cf. 487, 495nn.

494 not clearly, but he hints: Iol. spells out the implications of Dem.'s reluctance to start a civil war for the sake of the Hcld. (418-24).

495 find some way out of these difficulties: ἐξαμηχανέω is found only here and Wilkins wonders whether 'the compound [might have been] coined for the context'.

496 we must find: εὑρίσκειν depends on λέγει, which is jussive and equivalent to κελεύει: 'he orders us to find'.

498 lit. 'are we really held back by this statement [cf. 494] so as not to be saved?'

500-34: Heracles' daughter announces that she is willing to die and explains her reasons. Schmitt (1921) 28-9 criticized her speech as 'rather schematic, like the structure of this whole episode'. But although many of its elements are found in other self-sacrifice scenes (tabulated by Wilkins (1990b) 183), the speech is emotionally convincing and powerful. Wilamowitz (1882b) 343, followed by Schmitt (1921) 5, thought Heracles' daughter a poor *Vorstudie* for the much more effective Polyxena (*Hec.*), and found her character flat and uninspiring. However, if she is not a highly individualized figure, this is for a very simple reason: her role is more important than her character. She is brought on stage to die (and so develop the plot), not to be a subject of individual interest. Heracles' daughter considers three possible alternatives to self-sacrifice and rejects each one in turn (503-14, 515-19, 520-7). She first examines the consequences (both for herself and for Athens) of her failing to match the Athenians' generosity and courage, and argues that she will be killed in any case if she does not sacrifice herself.

500-2 Heracles' daughter responds without hesitation to the emergency described by Iol. **I am ready:** εἰμί is understood with ἑτοίμη; cf. Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 968-9. **to stand by for sacrifice and to die:** the *hysteron proteron* (θνήισκειν coming first) stresses her willingness to die for others.

506 when it is possible for us to save them: Wilkins rightly defends Nauck's emendation (σφε σῶσαι) against Pearson's defence of L (σεσῶσθαι), observing that 'the safety of both parties is combined in this scene'. Significantly, Heracles' daughter equates her own death by sacrifice with the Athenians' death in battle (cf. 421).

507 it is ... worthy: the neuter plural adj. (ἄξια) is used predicatively: cf. Bond on *Her.* 1058.

509 sprung from such a father as ours: her awareness of the consequences of noble birth align her with Iol. (297-303). In his terms, she proves to be one of the few children who are not inferior to their father: cf. 325-8, 484-5. Avery (1971) 542-3 remarks on how her courage makes her 'a sort of doublet for Heracles'.

510 seen to be cowards: cf. *Hec.* 348 κακὴ φανοῦμαι, *Phoen.* 1005 κακὸς φανήσομαι. For the use of ποῦ (= πῶς, 'How?'), and the sentiment, cf. 369-70.

511 I suppose: as Stevens (1976) 24 notes, οἶμαι is 'bitterly ironical'.

513 dishonourably: cf. Zuntz 107 'Kirchhoff's κἄπειτ' ἄτιμα for L's κἄπειτα τίνα is as brilliant as it looks simple - and it gives the proper contrast to the idea of honour which dominates Makaria's speech'.

515-19 She now pictures what would happen if the Hcld. were to be banished from Athens (so as to avoid the demand for sacrifice) and returned to traversing Greece in search of asylum (cf. 15-16, 47).

515 am I to ... become a wanderer?: Stephanus' ἀλητεύσω (aor. subj.) suits such a first-person appeal; e.g. *Hec.* 1056, 1079.

516 if someone then says: for the words of an anonymous speaker provoking shame, cf. 28n.

518 when you cling to your own lives: cf. 455, 533, Collard on *Hec.* 315 'cowardice is often censured in this word φιλοψυχεῖν, -ος, e.g. 348, *Hcld.* 518, *IA* 1385, all by self-sacrificing girls.' The idea of cowardice is given further emphasis here by the initial position of κακοῖς (519), contrasting with αὐτοὶ φιλοψυχοῦντες (518).

520-7 Heracles' daughter finally imagines her own fate if she survived but allowed her brothers to die.

520-2 no hope of happiness: cf. *Hec.* 370-1. For fear of betraying one's *philoi* as a motive for self-sacrifice, cf. *Alc.* 180-1, *Suppl.* 1024, *Phoen.* 1003.

520 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μέντοι is a striking combination, which Pearson renders as 'But apart from this not even if ...' (cf. *GP* 411); οὐδέ has the sense 'not even' rather than simply 'not either'.

523-4 a girl without family: since a woman's marriage was arranged by her male guardian (or *kyrios*: cf. *El.* 259, Blundell (474-7n.) 66-7, 114), the loss of her male kin would destroy a woman's chances of marriage and motherhood, and lead to both financial and social ruin. Heracles' daughter views such degradation as a fate worse than death (525-6).

526-7 more fitting for some other woman ...: the sentiment seems callous to us, but it is in line with the daughter's aristocratic viewpoint and her stress on εὐγένεια.

528-30 As Wilkins notes, 'The imperatives are notable, for women of this kind do not give commands to men ... The decision to die gives the daughter of Heracles the initiative and an authority to direct both her death and the arrangements for the beneficiaries (574ff.).'

529 garland it: for the garland worn by human sacrificial victims (animals had ribbons tied to their horns), see Dover on Ar. *Clouds* 256. **begin the rites, if it seems good:** the sense is excellent, but as it stands L's text breaches Porson's Law, which states that word end cannot occur after a long anceps in the the third metron (except after a monosyllable). Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (173-4n.) 179 insist that this law is always observed in tragedy, so that apparent exceptions are to be emended. West (76-8n.) 85, however, disagrees (cf. Diggle 314). For the actions involved in 'beginning the rites' (sprinkling water and barley, cutting a lock of the victim's hair), see Burkert (1985) 56.

530 this life is ready: cf. 502.

531 absolutely willing: cf. 413n. **I freely offer** (ἐξαγγέλλομαι)**:** 'I make a declaration on my own part' (Paley).

533-4 Because by not counting my own life dear: for μή (in place of οὐ) with a causal participle, see Pearson 143-6. **made the finest discovery:** εὕρημα (εὑρίσκω) cf. *Med.* 553, 716, *Ion* 1518.

537-8 nobler words ... nobler acts (sc. γενναία δράματα)**:** as Dover (1974) 161 observes, 'the sacrifice of one's life for the community was regarded as the supreme virtue'; cf. Thuc. 2.42.4 on the Athenian casualties of 431/430, whose moment of death is described as 'the climax of their lives, a culmination of glory, not of fear' (trans. R. Warner). Here, interestingly, the Chorus-leader applies the praise appropriate to a man's death in battle to the sacrificial death of a woman (cf. 506n.). His question is marked by artful word-order, including enjambment and hyperbaton (τούτων ... / μᾶλλον). Note the force of ἔτι: '... nobler words than these, <still more> who ...'.

539 you: lit. 'your head', a periphrasis often used to express affection; cf. *Ion* 1476, *Rhes.* 226, *Ant.* 1.

541-2 I feel no shame at your words: rather than referring to any shame he might feel because the Maiden has a chance to die while his has been denied him, 474-7 suggest that Iol. is talking about the Maiden's public stance; that is, he is expressing his lack of self-reproach that a girl in his care has 'come out' in an unwomanly way, for it is characteristic of her breeding (484-5, 540-1). The sentence is carefully structured as a chiasmus (verb / causative dative, caus. dat. / verb), while the rhyming couplet ('feel shame ... feel pain') puts emphasis on the final word and Iol.'s distress.

545 the one who draws the lot: coming after the decisive offer of Heracles' daughter, Iol.'s suggestion might seem to introduce a jarring element of randomness into the choice of sacrificial victim, but he merely intends it to be as fair as possible (cf. *Il.* 7.170-99, where the Greeks draw lots to face Hector in a duel). In the Athenian democratic polis election by lot was widely regarded as the most impartial way of assigning important functions to individuals. The fact that Heracles' daughter rejects this process (547) draws attention to her own particularly heroic choice.

548 service: as O'Connor-Visser (1987) 23 observes, χάρις here implies 'both "the favour to my family and the Athenians" and "the gratitude for my deed"'; cf. 214-22n.

551 I give my life: a very 'dynamic' present (δίδωμι).

553 nobler than your last: σοι is dative of advantage (Smyth §1481): her latest words are even more to her credit.

555 courage ... courage ... speech ... speech: the double polyptoton is emphatic; cf. *Phoen.* 536-8 (triple polyptoton underlining Jocasta's praise of Equality).

556 I certainly do not: οὐ μήν γε is very strong.

558-64 Kovacs (1996) 10-11 defends the order of the lines in L, but the proud 563 follows closely upon 559, while 564 picks up 561 (παρών). The transposition of 562-3 (suggested by Schenkl) offers the most economical solution to the dislocated manuscript order. For a concise introduction to the causes and detection of transposition, see Renehan (75-6n.) 35-7.

558 You have spoken well: L's κελεύεις makes no sense after 556 (the probable source of the copyist's mistake). Nauck's ἔλεξας is plain but appropriate (perhaps γ' ἔλεξας).

558-9 Do not fear ... pollution: Heracles' daughter responds to the reluctance evident in Iol.'s remarks (556) and frees him from the pollution of her death (cf. *Hipp.* 1448-52), so that he must face no legal or ritual sanctions as a result of it. **of my own free will:** *miasma* is averted because the death is freely chosen. Thus, during animal sacrifice, water was sprinkled on the victim to make it nod its head and so 'agree' to be killed. For the 'comedy of innocence' involved, cf. J. N. Bremmer, *Greek Religion* (Oxford, 1994) 41. But in view of 563, as Wilkins points out, ἐλευθέρως also has the sense 'as befits a free person'.

563 if indeed I am born of the father I claim to be: cf. 509, 539-41.

561 cover my body with my robes: as in modern times the moment of death is marked by covering the body (including the face); cf. *Hipp.* 1457-8. At *Hec.* 432 Polyxena asks Odysseus o cover her head with her robes in anticipation of her sacrifice. For the Maiden's unspoken wish not to expose her body, see the next note.

565-6 not in men's but in women's hands: The Maiden's request is motivated primarily by sexual modesty: the body is exposed by sacrifice (cf. *Hec.* 568-70) and vulnerable to

violation after it. However, the major role of women in funeral rituals is also a factor: the female relatives of the dead were responsible for preparing the corpse for burial by washing and dressing it (cf. the preparations of the suicidal Evadne (*Suppl.* 1054-7), Blundell (474-7n.) 72-3, 162-3); Alc. and the other daughters of Heracles would do so here, but the burial is merely foreshadowed in the play (586-9). Perhaps a priestess of Kore is to be imagined consecrating the virgin before the sacrifice? Unlike in *Hec.* (Neoptolemus) and *IA* (Agamemnon), we are never told who performs the sacrifice itself (cf. *Erechth.* fr. 370.66 K): it is the fact that the girl offers to die, not the identity of the killer, which is significant (cf. 500-34n.).

567-73 despite the efforts of Stoessl (1956) 228 to defend L's assignment of these lines to Iol., Heath is surely right to give them to Dem. τοῦ δικαίου (570) picks up Dem.'s insistence on justice (cf. 424). Lines 572-3 ('say your last words of farewell to these boys and the old man') would be absurd coming from Iol., while the opening words ('It shall be so') answer the request made in 565-6 and intended for Dem. Moreover, they answer the request authoritatively, which only Dem. is in a position to do (cf. *Alc.* 328). Although the Maiden urges Iol. to ask Dem. on her behalf, Dem. responds immediately, showing his gratitude to her personally (cf. 568n.). Dem. has remained silent since the entry of Heracles' daughter (474), and as Grube (1941) 170 saw, there is a reason why he waits until now to react to her intervention: 'It was not for him to accept her sacrifice too soon, since he would not demand it from any of his own subjects ... Only here, when all is settled and before her farewells, he speaks.' But Dem. cannot end this scene and all is now clear for the Maiden's *envoi* (574-96) and Iol.'s final farewell (597-607).

567 most pitiable girl: lit. 'o miserable among girls/maidens'; this use of the partitive gen. is characteristic of epic (e.g. δῖα θεάων, 'queen among goddesses'). In later Greek it is confined to vocatives: see Barrett on *Hipp.* 848-9. It gives Dem.'s address an elevated and particularly dignified beginning.

568 it would be shameful for me: cf. Cairns (1993) 269 n. 15 'it would be *aischron* for Dem. to deny her the honour she deserves, and, since her sacrifice frees him from a dilemma ..., it would be *aischron* for him to fail to show gratitude.' **buried:** for κοσμέω used of proper burial rites, cf. *Andr.* 1160.

569 courage: εὐψυχία is a term usually applied to male courage in battle (cf. *Suppl.* 161, Dover (1974) 166): 506, 537-8nn.

570 bravest of all women: with an undertone of 'saddest of all women'; for the ambiguity (courage and helplessness) of τλήμων, cf. Collard on *Hec.* 562 (Polyxena's death).

571 my eyes have ever seen: the pleonasm emphasizes Dem.'s certainty.

573 last words of farewell: for last words uttered by a dying character, cf. *Hec.* 413; to the dying, cf. *Med.* 1069, *Hipp.* 1099, *Tro.* 1184.

574-96: The final speech of Heracles' daughter is remarkable for its authoritative tone (cf. 528-30n.) and its series of injunctions to both Iol. (574-80) and the Hcld. (581-90). O'Connor-Visser (1987) 28 complains that the daughter of Heracles 'delivers her sensible statements in rather an aloof, impersonal way', but in Greek terms (both moral and dramatic) her tone of solemn formality suits the occasion (cf. the final instructions of *Alc.* 280-325; 579-80n.). Thus it is unfair to call her a 'prig' (McLean (1934) 206) or 'altklug' and 'nicht ... so sehr heroisch' (Wilamowitz (1882b) 343). Schmitt (1921) 44 compared this speech of farewell with the

stichomythia between mother and child in *Hec.* (414-31) and *IA* (1431-66), finding the latter technique more pathetic. Here, such a close concentration on the parent-child relationship is impossible, but the speech does refer to the quasi-parental roles of both Iol. and Alc. (578, 584-5), and its depiction of lost marriage and motherhood is moving in its own right (cf. 500-34n.). D. Galeotti Papi, 'La scena di Macaria negli Eraclidi e l'oratoria funebre', *RFIC* 123 (1995) 140-154 discusses the entire scene as a dramatization of the traditional funeral speech (*epitaphios logos*). Some of the parallels which she draws seem tenuous, but the analogy (p. 143) between the daughter's final speech and the closing section of παραμυθία ('encouragement', 'exhortation') found in actual fourth-century *epitaphioi logoi* is apt. The only surviving fifth-century example of the genre, Pericles' funeral speech in Thuc. 2.35-46, is unique in several respects (see Hornblower ad loc.), but it indicates that a dramatic speech of this kind would have a resonant and powerful impact on an Athenian audience at the start of the Peloponnesian War.

575-6 τοιούσδε is proleptic, lit. 'teach these boys to be such men', i.e. like you. **wise for every event, and no wiser:** the stress on practical wisdom and moderation is traditional; excessive intellectual *sophia* could be suspicious: cf. *Med.* 294-306, *Bacch.* 395. **that will suffice:** the Greek expression is personal ('they'll do very nicely'), emphasizing the nature of the boys themselves.

577 **with all your heart:** for the adverbial force of πρόθυμος ὤν, cf. Willink on *Or.* 1056-7.

578 **we are your children ... raised by your hands:** Heracles is dead and the Hcld.'s mother is never mentioned. Iol.'s virtual parenthood intensifies the pathos of the girl's death.

579-80 **You see me:** Greeks (especially the heroic figures of tragedy) were not bashful about drawing attention to their good deeds, especially on behalf of their family and city; cf. 588-90, *Alc.* 323-5, *IA* 1383-4, Dover (1974) 234-5. **giving up my chance of marriage:** lit. 'time of marriage'; cf. *Hec.* 416, *IA* 1398-9, *Ant.* 917-18, Lyons (Intro. n. 27) 64; also Griffith on *Ant.* 806-16 'Greek marriage and funeral ceremonies had many similarities, esp. from the bride's perspective (torches, veils, the escorted journey to a new and unfamiliar "home", fear and lamentation at loss of loved ones, delivery into the hands of a new "owner", etc.).'

581-3 Heracles' daughter turns to her brothers and wishes them a happy future. Wilkins (1990a) 335-6 discusses her role as a protector of young children both present and future (*kourotrophos*), comparing her to Athena. **which my heart will now be denied:** lit. 'of which my heart will formerly be thwarted'. Even in wishing well there is stress on her own loss.

582 **may you flourish:** εὐδαιμονεῖν is *vox Euripidea* (cf. *El.* 231, *Phoen.* 1086); for the optative as a farewell-formula, cf. *Alc.* 1137, *Med.* 1073.

584-6 **Honour ... these hosts of ours:** the Athenians are to be treated with as much respect as the Hcld.'s closest *philoi*.

587-8 for the pattern 'if you return home ... remember', cf. 310-15. The Hcld.'s return to the Peloponnese is merely alluded to in this play (310-11, 586-7, 875-8): see Intro. §1(a).

588-9 The prospective victim requests a proper burial in Argos (made clear by νόστος 587). This, however, does not rule out a cult of Heracles' daughter in Attica, since even if her body was successfully returned to Argos (about which the play says nothing; cf. the silence over Evadne's remains at the end of *Suppl.*), hero(in)es could be worshipped far

from their actual graves. Nevertheless, as Wilkins (1990a) 331 n. 30 observes, 'The delayed burial is extraordinary.' See further Intro. §1(f). **the finest funeral would be right:** lit. 'it is right [to bury me] in the finest fashion'.

591-2 A young woman's premature death is reason for her to lament the loss of the defining marks of female maturity (marriage, sex, and motherhood): cf. 579-80n. Heracles' daughter sees her glorious death as a kind of compensation for the children she might have had and for her lost virginity (lost, that is, in death rather than through sex: cf. 408-9 (v) n.). **treasure-store:** for treasured possessions in the underworld, cf. Soph. *El.* 437-8 (where the wish is harshly sarcastic). On the related idea of gifts buried with the dead, see E. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (California, 1979) 56-7. **if there is anything beneath the earth:** the Greeks had no fixed ideas about the afterlife and such expressions of uncertainty are common (cf. Dover (1974) 243, 266-7); contrast Iol.'s confident prediction at 320-7. The Maiden's doubts, raised tentatively here, are expanded emphatically in the following lines.

593-6 Heracles' daughter hopes that death is the end of suffering, a traditional idea (see Griffith on *PV* 750-1) whose impact here, in her final words, is one of pathetic consolation: cf. Soph. *El.* 1170, *Alc.* 937-8, *Hipp.* 1371-3.

597-9 Iol. hails the courage of Heracles' daughter (cf. 569n.) and promises to honour her. For ἀλλά expressing 'a sympathetic reaction to the previous speaker's words or actions', see *GP* 19. **most:** μέγιστον is adverbial acc. **both living and dead:** cf. 320.

600-1 Holy fear: Heracles' daughter is on her way to be sacrificed and Iol. is naturally reluctant to offend the goddess who has promised the Hcld. survival as a result of her death (491). Criticism would also be tactless when the girl has willingly 'consecrated' herself to the goddess (the verb looks forward to the sacrificial rites; cf. 529n.). Nevertheless, as 605-7 make clear, Iol. is deeply grieved by the demand. The daughter of Heracles departs to the right (cf. Intro. §5), presumably to a local shrine of Kore, though this is not made clear (cf. 528-9). Her exit to premature death is moving, but Burnett (1976) 16 exaggerates the stage business when she calls it 'the spectacular high point of the tragedy'. Its simplicity and finality make it all the more effective.

602-7: Strohm (1957) 21 well remarks how the altar, site of the Hcld.'s successful supplication, makes an effective place for Iol.'s emotional and physical collapse.

603-4 set me down on the altar here: Lesky (1977) 234-5 took these lines as evidence for a missing scene before 630, but his interpretation of the stage action is mistaken: see 630-747n. **hiding me with these robes:** Iol. shrouds his head in grief (cf. 561n.).

607 my ruin ... catastrophe: the compressed, balanced phrases encapsulate the misery of Iol.'s life, both past and future.

608-29: Third Song (Second *Stasimon*) of the Chorus.

The old men of Marathon have witnessed the departure of Heracles' daughter to her death; and now they have seen Iol. break down in grief as a result. At this point they step forward and sing an ode of sympathy and consolation. The stasimon is the shortest and, in terms of structure, the most straightforward in the play. Its simple form is complemented by an emphasis on traditional thought (especially in the first strophe), which is intended to comfort Iol. The Chorus begin by stressing the instability of human fortune; there is no escape from fated suffering (608-17). Turning to Iol. in the antistrophe, they urge him to temper his grief,

and remind him of the glorious reputation that the daughter of Heracles will enjoy because of her heroic death (619-28; cf. *Phoen.* 1054-61 for similar choral praise of Menoeceus).

Wilamowitz (1882b) 342 thought that a second strophic pair, or at least an epode, had been lost, where the Chorus acclaimed Heracles' daughter and spoke of the Hcld.'s certain victory. However, there is already abundant praise for the daughter of Heracles, both in the antistrophe and in the preceding scene, where it is also stressed several times that her sacrifice will guarantee victory for both Athens and the Hcld. Although the Chorus' song is brief, it is well suited to its place in the action. It brings the harrowing scene of self-sacrifice to a reflective and comforting end, and prepares for the positive arrival of the Servant (630), who immediately announces a sudden upturn in the Hcld.'s fortunes (cf. 635, 637, 641).

The metre is dactylic; for the full scheme, see Wilkins 129; cf. Dale, *MATC* (1983) 281. Aesch. uses primarily dactylic stanzas several times, Soph. just once in the surviving plays (*OT* 151-8 = 159-66), but only Eur. makes use of uniformly dactylic stanzas (cf. Dale (1968) 31-2): *Andr.* 1173-83 = 1186-96 (Peleus), *Suppl.* 271-85 (Chorus), *Tro.* 595-600 = 601-607 (Andromache and Hecuba), *Phoen.* 784-800 = 801-817 (Chorus). Interestingly, two of these passages are laments (*Andr.*, *Tro.*), while the *Suppl.* passage combines lament with supplication (cf. the partly dactylic *kommoi* of Soph., e.g. *El.* 121-250). So the metre is appropriate to lament and commemoration of the dead (cf. *Il.* 24.725-45, 748-59, 762-75), while its epic associations give the Chorus' praise of the Maiden's courage a solemn and heroic effect.

608-9 No man ... without the will of the gods: the idea that power over human fortune rests ultimately with the gods is a basic tenet of popular thought (Zeus is often singled out as having supreme control, e.g. *Ag.* 1485-8); it can be used for various ends, such as to encourage worship or (as here) restrain grief and criticism. **endures a heavy fate:** the adj. is characteristically tragic; cf. *Phil.* 1095, Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 1345.

610-12 nobody can hope to escape misfortune forever; another traditional gnome (cf. Soph. fr. 946 R), here applied to a house, with 'μβεβάναι suggesting its foundations (rather than 'does not always *tread the path* of prosperity' (Loeb)). However, perhaps 'nobody' (608) should be understood as the subject of ἐμβεβάναι (610) and the object of διώκει (612)? For οὐ θεῶν ἄτερ (608) combined with μοῖρα ('fate'), cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 5.76. Cf. also Willink on *Or.* 977-8 'μοῖρα is less random than τύχη ['chance'] ..., but similarly inscrutable to mortals.'

613-14 settles from high to low estate: the subject, fate, is understood from the previous sentence. 'ὤικισε ... completes the metaphor of the low cabin contrasted with the lofty estate' (Pearson); cf. 46, *Tro.* 612-13. The aorist is gnomic (coupled with the 'timeless' pres. τεύχει); cf. Smyth §1931, Goodwin §154. **a wanderer:** the sense is good but ἀλήταν does not scan; the rhythm short-short-long is needed to give strophic responsion with 625. Lobeck's ἀτίταν is attractive (it is accepted in Garzya's Teubner text), but whether it can have the meaning required here ('unhonoured' = LSJ *s.v.* ἀτίτης III) is controversial: cf. Fraenkel on *Ag.* 72, Zuntz 43 n. 3. Given the emphasis so far on the Hcld.'s status as wanderers, Boeckh's τὸν δὲ πλάνητ' is a possibilty (cf. 878), perhaps changed to ἀλήταν under the influence of 51, 224, 364 and 515? It is remarkable that nobody seems to have suggested the apt ἱκέταν ('suppliant': 33, 196, 224, etc.).

615-17 To escape ... not permitted: another (fatalistic) gnome: cf. *Sept.* 263, 281, *Her.* 309-11. By extension μόρσιμος can mean simply 'fated to die'; cf. *Il.* 22.13 (Apollo to

Achilles) οὐ μέν με κτενέεις, ἐπεὶ οὔ τοι μόρσιμός εἰμι ('You will not kill me because I am not destined to die'). **cleverness:** cf. 575-6n.

619-28: In the antistrophe the Chorus move from the level of general reflection on fate and the gods to the particular events before them, consoling Iol. with praise of his granddaughter's excellence. The movement from general reflection to direct address is a common feature of tragic lyric: cf. e.g. *Med.* 410-45, Stevens on *Andr.* 274-308.

619-20 do not fall prostrate, but bear the will of the gods: Kovacs (1996) 11 prefers Lesky's στένε ('Do not fall prostrate and *lament* the gods' dispensation') to Elmsley's φέρε since the latter entails that 'μὴ has to be taken exclusively with the participle', but this is perfectly good Greek when (as here) the clause is dependent on an imperative: cf. Diggle 225. For τὰ θεῶν φέρε, cf. *Phoen.* 382, *IT* 475-8.

621 glorious (εὐδόκιμον)**:** a word suited to glory won in battle; cf. *Suppl.* 1130, *Andr.* 797, *Pers.* 857, 537-8n.

622 on behalf of her brothers and this land: the city is Athens, which her sacrifice will soon save from defeat by Argos; cf. 491, 506. The return of the Hcld. themselves to reclaim their ancestral rights in Argos is presented as a less immediate consequence of her death; cf. 586-8, 873-8.

623-4 a renowned reputation: lit. 'a reputation not without fame', an emphatic litotes; cf. *Il.* 12.318-19.

625 Excellence comes through toil: the idea that *arete* requires much effort is proverbial: cf. Bond on *Her.* 355-8. Here its lucid one-line expression throws the thought into relief. This is a pivotal gnome (for this common technique in choral lyric, cf. Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 376-8), summing up what has gone before and leading on to the Chorus' praise of the girl's *eugeneia* (626-7). The language of 'excellence' and 'toils' is characteristic of Pindar: cf. e.g. *Ol.* 8.5-8. Like an epinician chorus, the old men of Marathon celebrate the virgin's self-sacrifice as an achievement that wins her κλέος (cf. 623-4) and proves her excellence. For the influence of epinician poetry on tragedy in general, see Herington (353-80n.) 26-31, 55-6.

626-7 worthy of her father, worthy of her noble birth: the anaphora is insistent (cf. 491n.). The Chorus console Iol. with the thought that the daughter of Heracles has succeeded in living up to her father's great example (cf. 509, 513, 539-41, 563).

627-8 If you honour the deaths of brave people: ἀγαθῶν may mean 'well-born', picking up from 626-7, but 'brave' is preferable because it stresses the value of the virgin's *actions* (rather than her social standing), as is appropriate to praise of the dead: cf. Thuc. 2.42.2. It is also the Homeric word, and these are dactyls (cf. 608-29n.).

628 I share your feelings: lit. 'I take part with you [i.e. in honouring the dead]'; the absence of a defining gen. lends the short phrase, the Chorus' concluding mark of sympathy, extra force.

630-747: Scene Four (Third *Epeisodion*): Servant, Iolaus, Alcmene.

A servant arrives to report the return of Hyllus, Heracles' son (cf. 45-7). He raises the dejected Iol., who summons Alc. from the temple to hear the cheering news. Alc., however, mistakes the Servant for the Herald of Eury. and has to be reassured by Iol. that he means no harm. This moment of confusion and mistaken idenitity is a prelude to one of the most intriguingly comic scenes in extant tragedy (cf. 680-747nn.), as a decrepit Iol. prepares to enter battle only

to have his efforts ironically undercut by the Servant. Nevertheless, despite its surprises and comic tone, the scene has a serious and deliberate purpose, emphasizing how crucial the imminent conflict is to the survival of the Hcld., and preparing for the miracle of Iol.'s battlefield rejuvenation.

As we saw in Intro. §2(a), there is no need to adopt either Kirchhoff or Wilamowitz's suggestions of a missing scene after 629 or the wholesale rewriting of 630-60. The absence of any mention of Heracles' daughter is not a problem to be explained by positing a lacuna, but a deliberate element of the plot. The Chorus has already honoured and lamented the girl's death in suitably heroic terms (cf. 608-29n.), and this marks the end of her role in the play. Instead of concentrating further on her death, Eur. maintains the pace of the action and turns our attention to the battle against the Argives and Iol.'s unexpected role in it: cf. Intro. §2(b).

Lesky (1977) 234-5 thought that Iol. had left the altar between 602ff. and 630 and that this supported the theory of a missing scene (containing a report of the daughter's death). However, as Martin Cropp, '*Herakleidai* 603-4, 630ff., and the Question of the Mutilation of the Text', *AJP* 101 (1980) 283-6 has shown, Lesky's understanding of the text and the implied stage-action is faulty. At 630ff. Iol. is found collapsed beside the altar; Lesky (p. 234) finds this inconsistent with 603-4, where, he argues, Iol. 'sits on a step of the altar and supports his back on it'. However, as Cropp makes clear (p. 285), εἰς ἕδραν does not imply 'seatedness', nor does ἐρείσατε imply 'leaning', and 'Iolaus may quite well be lowered into a prostrate position at the altar after 603, and hence be seen as "lying" by the servant at 633.'

630-1 the entry of the Servant is unannounced, as regularly in the case of anonymous slaves (and messengers; cf. 784-891n.). *Pace* Lesky (1977) 234, these lines do not show that Iol. is no longer 'at the altar ... where he [the Servant] expected to find them'. They simply indicate that the Servant does not immediately see Iol., who is lying beside the altar with his head covered in grief. Line 631, deleted by Klinkenberg, is bracketed by Kovacs (Loeb), but it is quite appropriate to the context (the Servant wants Alc. to hear his good news as well) and an effective cue for Iol.'s summoning of Alc. from the temple (642-3). **greetings to you** (χαίρετε)**:** or perhaps 'rejoice!'; cf. 637.

633 **why the dejected look?:** as additional proof of a missing scene Lesky (1977) 234 argued that this line was inconsistent with 604, where Iol. is covered with his robes, making it impossible for the Servant to see his face. But Iol.'s head is merely veiled, not wrapped up out of sight. Also, as Cropp (630-747n.) 285-6 points out, although Iol. has raised his head slightly to utter 632, his downcast look is natural for someone lying on the ground. Stevens (1976) 22 observes that the use of τί χρῆμα as 'equivalent to τί in the sense "why?" ... seems to be confined to Euripides'. A more animated form of τί, it expresses the speaker's intense surprise: cf. 646, 709.

634 **some personal worry:** Pearson's translation 'a family sorrow' seems to strain the sense of φροντίς ('anxiety, deep thought'), while οἰκεῖος may be metaphorical rather than literal, either 'very personal, inward' or 'close to home'. In addition, Iol.'s brief and vague response is motivated not so much by a desire 'to avoid telling the spectators what they already know' (Pearson) as by a shameful reluctance to confess to human sacrifice (cf. *Alc.* 518ff.). **I am in its grip:** the imperf. (συνειχόμην) stresses the continuing effects of the sorrow, but Wilkins, following Barrett's defence of κατέσχετο at *Hipp.* 27, shows that a good case can be made for L's aor. mid. συνεσχόμην used in a pass. sense ('I was gripped by it'), which stresses the moment when Iol. was first seized by grief.

638 I don't remember: Iol.'s forgetfulness is pathetic. As with his lack of strength (cf. 636), the effect is to heighten the incongruity of his desire to fight (680-747n.).

639 Hyllus' servant: πενέστης can mean simply 'slave' (LSJ *s.v.* II) but it more often refers to the serfs of Thessaly (cf. H. D. Westlake, *Thessaly in the Fourth Century B.C.* (London, 1935) 27-37), an association appropriate to Hyllus, who was ancestor of one of the three Dorian *phylai*, the Hylleis: cf. Intro. §1(a).

640 to save us from harm: Porson proposed reversing the order to νῶιν σωτὴρ βλάβης on metrical gounds (cf. 529n.), but this is denied by Pearson 'since, although νῶιν is not an enclitic, it belongs at least as much to σωτὴρ as to βλάβης'. For other conjectures, cf. D. Kovacs, 'Coniectanea Euripidea', *GRBS* 29 (1988) 115-34, p. 123, Kovacs (1996) 11-13.

641 Certainly; and, what's more: both μάλιστα and καὶ πρός γ' have a colloquial ring that suits the Servant's cheerful manner; cf. Stevens (1976) 16, 57. The idea of 'safety' (640) is enhanced into 'good fortune'.

642-3 Iol. summons Alc. from the temple to hear the Servant's encouraging report. Wilamowitz (1882b) 341-2, who rejected 630-60 as as the work of a fourth-century adapter, took especial exception to 642-58 (p. 341): 'In fact I am very pleased that Euripides is innocent of the tastlelessness of these verses.' He objected to the fact that Alc. did not respond to Iol.'s earlier shouting (69ff.) and found it odd that she hears Iol.'s summons (642-3), but not the positive reason for it (643-5). However, Wilamowitz failed to understand the theatrical (i.e. non-realistic) conventions involved. As Mastronarde (1979) 29 observes, Alc. enters now because she is called by name (642), but she does not hear the details of 643-5.

644-5 agonized: lit. 'melted away in your soul'; for the metaphor, cf. *Med.* 141, 159. **return:** i.e. Hyllus' return from his mission in search of help (cf. 45-7); contrast 310, 587, where νόστος refers to the Hcld.'s return to the Peloponnese.

646-53 Alc.'s entry in response to a cry on stage replays the *boêdromia* of the opening scene (cf. 73-4, 120-3nn.), but here the supposed Herald of Eury. exists only in her imagination. Whereas Iol. in his grief did not recognize the Servant (cf. 638-9), fear causes Alc. to mistake the Servant for someone else and threaten him with retaliation. How are we to interpret Alc.'s spirited but misguided entrance? Burian (1977) 11 finds it 'at least partly comic in its effect' (so too Burnett (1998) 149-50), but Alc. is, like the Chorus (702-8), a serious foil to Iolaus' surprising behaviour: neither she nor the Chorus can understand his decision to enter battle, and their perplexity and disapproval highlight its strangeness. (Contrast the comic misrecognitions of *Ion* 517ff. and *IA* 819ff.) On the other hand, many find Alc.'s entrance sinister and take it to foreshadow Alc.'s later aggression and lack of pity towards Eury.: cf. e.g. Pearson xxix-xxx, Zuntz 36-7 (who thinks that Alc. 'behaves like a chicken in a thunderstorm'), Grube (1941) 171, Lesky (1977) 237, Albini (1993) 109. In addition, Falkner (1989) 123-5 argues that Eur. is drawing on a wider cultural stereotype of the aggressive old woman. However, one should not overlook the fact that Alc.'s desperation on behalf of the children evokes sympathy. Such a response is confirmed by Alc.'s language, which echoes that of Iol. in the opening scene (cf. 648-50, 652-3nn.). As Burian (1977) 11 remarks, 'Her brief appearance, far from foreshadowing her later brutality, makes it even more shocking'.

646-7 Both here and at 709 the OCT punctuates as if τί χρῆμα were equivalent to τί in the sense 'why?' (cf. 633). However, Reiske proposed τί χρῆμ'; αὐτῆς πᾶν τόδ' ἐπλήσθη

στέγος· / Ἰόλαε, μῶν ..., and this is supported by Mastronarde (1979) 29 n. 40, 'since it produces the standard agnoetic question and an undirected comment preceding the establishment of contact with the vocative'; cf. Zuntz 36 n. 2. The change makes for a more forceful opening: 'What's going on? The whole temple here is full of shouting. Iolaus, it's surely not ...'. **shouting:** a regular entry-motif, cf. 478-9n., *Hec.* 1109.

647-8 surely not: μῶν (= μὴ οὖν) sometimes expects the answer 'no' (cf. Smyth §2651), but as Barrett points out (on *Hipp.* 794), 'μῶν X' is also used when 'I think X possible or even probable, and my reluctance is due to apprehension ..., or to surprise, at the possibility.' Here Alc.'s apprehension is obvious; cf. similarly 676. **some herald:** for the note of scorn in the use of τις, cf. 193-4n.

648-50 Alc.'s words recall the combination of physical weakness and mental determination shown by Iol. in the prologue. **my strength may be weak:** cf. 11, 23, 58. **you will never ... while I still live:** cf. 64, 66.

651-2 If so, may ... Heracles' mother!: Alc.'s courage is motivated by concerns similar to her granddaughter's: cf. 509, 563.

652-3 a shameful struggle with two old people: cf. 39. Shame, however, did not deter the Herald from abusing old Iol. even on holy ground (67ff.).

654 do not be afraid: Iol. reassures Alc. as Dem. (248) and Heracles' daughter (500, 558) reassured him.

656 raise a ... shout: cf. 73-4.

657 ὅπως βαίης is dependent on ἔστησας (656).

659 your grandson: 'child of one's child' is the normal Greek for grandchild; cf. 710, 713.

660 for this report of yours: causal dat.; cf. 474-7n.

661-2 the double question 'why ... where?' is highly compressed, but there is no need to posit a lacuna between the lines (*pace* Kovacs (1996) 13). For ἀτάρ expressing 'a break-off, a sudden change of topic', see *GP* 52; cf. 879.

662-3 what misfortune: συμφορά basically means 'event', but the word is regularly coloured by context: 'misfortune' is better suited to Alc.'s mood of anxiety.

664 Alc. has been wondering why Hyllus is staying away from the temple and where he might be instead. As Mastronarde (1979) 41 n. 18 observes, 'line 664 as a whole tells why, and the opening word στρατόν implies where.' In the prologue Hyllus and his eldest brothers are said to be away searching for an alternative refuge (45-7), so his arrival here with an allied army is highly surprising: cf. Intro. §2(b).

665-6 no longer concerns us: Alc. asserts that she and Iol., as a woman and an old man, have nothing to do with military affairs. Kovacs (1996) 13-14, however, interprets ἡμῖν as meaning ἐμοί, and sees a division along gender lines (so too Pearson), but this does not fit Iol.'s response in 666, where μέτεστιν picks up ἡμῖν and refers to Iol. as well. Moreover, Alc.'s claim is startlingly disproved by Iol.'s battlefield exploits. The withdrawal of Alc. allows Iol. and the Servant to begin their (increasingly comic) dialogue.

668 τι = 'approximately'; cf. 674, LSJ *s.v.* τις A.II.8

669 more exactly: a sense derived from ἄλλος meaning 'as well'; cf. Smyth §1272, LSJ *s.v.* II.8, K-G i. 275.

672-3 what?: γάρ signals a surprised question; cf. *Med.* 689, *GP* 77-8. **for action** (ὡς ἐς ἔργον)**:** 'ἐς states the object aimed at and ὡς the intention of the agent - "with a view to the action."' (Pearson) Page (221-2n.) 38 thought that these lines were inserted to cover

the gap left by the missing scene (cf. 630-747n.), as if σφάγια here referred to Heracles' daughter. But in fact these are the sacrificial victims prepared at 399-400 and killed at 819-22 after Hyllus' attempt to avert battle fails (802-18). **far from the ranks:** Wilkins argues 'The point of ἔκας is that the victims are taken out far *in front of* the lines [my italics], as close to the enemy as possible, to urge on the troops. If this is normal practice it is attested nowhere else.' But it seems unlikely that the victims are meant to be on the spot when the battle is afterwards fought. And if they are 'far in front of the lines', they will be too close to the enemy, if the Argives are clearly within view (675).

678 **deprived of my assistance:** lit. 'bereft of my part'; τοὐμὸν μέρος, 'what I can provide', is adverbial acc. after ἐρήμους. For the important role played by slaves in Greek warfare, see P. Hunt, *Slaves, Warfare, and Ideology in the Greek Historians* (Cambridge, 1998), concluding (p. 219) 'The vague notion that slaves could not fight for masters whose domination they often hated turns out to be a pious hope.' In Athens slaves were paid the same as their hoplite masters, one drachma (six obols) per day (Thuc. 3.17.4), and were presumably allowed to keep some or all of it, depending on their master. Slaves might be motivated to fight for a number of reasons, including money, loyalty, fear of reprisals if they refused, and the hope that they might be rewarded for their efforts by being set free, as indeed seems to happen (uniquely for extant tragedy) in this play: cf. 890-1n.

680-747: Iol.'s sudden announcement that he will accompany the Servant to the battlefield is greeted with bemused incredulity. The Servant undermines Iol.'s enthusiasm for war with humorous ripostes that render the old man's intentions ludicrous. As Zuntz 29 observes, 'The sudden bellicosity of the old man who had so long been prostrate with distress ... could not but appear as a glaring absurdity.' Some scholars, however, have questioned the presence of humour in the scene. John Wilkins, for example, the most recent editor of the play, takes a very sceptical view of supposed comic elements here (see in particular his notes on 680-701 and 720-47). On the other hand, many of those who actually accept that the scene is funny have interpreted this as a dramatic failing, as if the comedy ruined the proper tragic atmosphere of the play. So if we believe, as I shall argue we should, that the scene was intended to make the audience laugh, we still have to explain the purpose of this surprising change of tone. For the irruption of laughter into the play is indeed unexpected and has troubled many critics. Grube (1941) 171-2, for example, though refreshingly appreciative of the scene's combination of pathos and humour, thinks that 'the dramatist has not succeeded in obtaining any clear effect.' But such uneasiness springs from two important errors: a failure to appreciate the scene's contribution to the play as a whole and an unwillingness to acknowledge the generic fluidity of tragedy itself.

While it is widely agreed that 'the two genres [tragedy and comedy] were polarized to some degree, and mutually defined each other by contrasts' (O. Taplin, 'Comedy and the Tragic', in M. Silk (ed.), *Tragedy and the Tragic* (Oxford, 1996) 188-202, p. 188), there are also many signs that the two genres interacted and influenced one another from an early date (for 'paratragedy' before Aristophanes, cf. M. Silk, 'Aristophanic Paratragedy', in A. H. Sommerstein et al (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis* (Bari, 1993) 477-504, p. 477 n. 1). The use of laughter by tragic poets need not surprise; after all, there are funny scenes in epic (cf. e.g. the Battle of the Gods in *Iliad* 21), which was one of the most important elements in the genesis of tragedy and the production of tragic story-patterns. Both Aesch. and Soph.

present characters, Orestes' nurse, Cilissa, in the *Choephori* (753-60), and the Guard in the *Antigone* (223-331, 384-445), whose impact is at least partly amusing: Cilissa's homely reminiscences of the baby Orestes throw the surrounding family carnage into even sharper relief, while the Guard's selfish regard for his own survival contrasts with Antigone's principled self-sacrifice. Interestingly, all the humorous scenes of extant tragedy involve either old men or figures of lower social status, suggesting that the tragedians were drawing on the same stereotypes of class and age that we find in Attic Old Comedy (for the impertinent slaves of Athens, compare the Old Oligarch's complaint, [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.10). The *Hcld.* scene brings together two traditional comic figures - the old man and the cheeky slave - and thereby cues the audience for a potentially humorous interaction.

Despite the occasional amusing elements in Aesch. and Soph., it is Eur. who experiments most extensively with laughter in tragedy and with the complication of tone that results from it. Indeed, his readiness to include comic elements may have gone too far for some, and what we might call a 'purist' attitude to tragedy is expressed by the victorious Aesch. of Aristophanes' *Frogs*, who bans Eur. from ever occupying the Throne of Tragedy in Hades and calls him a βωμολόχος (1521; cf. 358, 1085), a 'buffoon'. Dover (on *Frogs* 358) cites Aristotle's treatment of βωμολοχία as 'the habit of turning everything into a joke, no matter how inappropriate the occasion' (*EN* 1108a24f.). So Aristophanes seems to be suggesting that Eur.'s comic elements are out of place in tragedy. By contrast, the Aristophanic Eur. takes pride in having introduced 'everyday matters' (οἰκεῖα πράγματα 959) to the tragic stage, and is proud too of making 'the wife speak, and the slave just as much, and the master, and the maiden, and the old crone' (949-50, trans. Sommerstein). In fact, the Servant of the *Hcld.* has much in common with the cheeky, chatty slaves of comedy, and it is precisely such scenes that will have incensed tragic 'purists'.

Of course, Aristophanes exaggerates and polarizes the dramatic styles of both Aesch. and Eur. for comic effect, so his play does not prove that Euripidean tragedy was regarded by the Athenian audience as degenerately comic. Nevertheless, the *Frogs* does point to an awareness that Eur.'s use of comic elements was particularly innovative. Moreover, the *Hcld.* shows Eur. using such elements much earlier than is generally appreciated. In one of the most influential articles on the topic ('Euripidean Comedy', in B. M. W. Knox, *Word and Action. Essays on the Ancient Theater* (Baltimore, 1979) 250-74; orig. publ. in 1970), Bernard Knox focuses on the *Ion*, *IT*, and *Helen*, where Eur.'s use of such plot devices as misrecognitions, narrow escapes, and 'happy endings' have long been seen to foreshadow developments in later Greek, and Roman, and hence modern comedy (Knox ascribes to Eur. (p. 268) the invention of the 'master pattern of western comedy'). However, the influence of Eur.'s plot patterns on later drama (both tragedy and comedy) should not be allowed to obscure the fact that Eur. was experimenting with comedy long before the *Ion*, albeit in a less sustained manner, at the level of the single scene. (The earliest play considered by Knox is the *Electra* (*c.* 422-16), but he makes no mention of the *Hcld.*)

As noted above, we should beware of exaggerating the stylistic and thematic boundaries between tragedy and comedy. Eur. was not breaking the mould of a set genre, but rather exploring the possibilities of a flexible literary form: cf. D. J. Mastronarde, 'Euripidean Tragedy and Genre: The Terminology and its Problems,' *ICS* 24-25 (1999-2000) 23-39. An early and fascinating example of Eur.'s readiness to experiment with dramatic form is supplied by the *Alcestis*, produced in 438 in place of a satyr-play. In fact Burnett (1998) 156 has even suggested that the *Hcld.* too 'was meant to cap a trilogy', but the features which she

claims are satryic (such as colloquialisms and folk-tale motifs) occur in other plays whose tragic credientials are not in doubt. (Paley 323 too had suggested a pro-satyric *Hcld.* because of the play's 'want of tragic interest', but see below.) Nevertheless, the fact that the presence of comic elements makes Burnett think the play to be pro-satyric is symptomatic of a wider critical uncertainty with the tone and impact of the play as a whole. The key question is: *Does the comedy in this scene deprive the play of serious tragic meaning?* I shall argue that by enhancing the impact of Iol.'s subsequent victory, the comedy contributes towards the shocking effect of Alc.'s revenge in the final scene and thereby supports the tragic meaning of the action.

The most extensive treatment of the scene to date from the point of view of comedy is that of Bernd Seidensticker, *Palintonos Harmonia: Studien zu komischen Elementen in der griechischen Tragödie* (Göttingen, 1982) 92-100. Seidensticker makes many perceptive comments on the comic development of the scene, but he ends his discussion of the scene's role in the development of the play by saying that (p. 100) 'It is perhaps better not to burden the little farce with too deep a significance for the whole.' He even speculates that Eur. could not resist the temptation to illuminate the traditional miracle of Iol.'s rejuvenation in a 'little crowd-pleasing farce' (100 n. 42). Although Seidensticker is reluctant to credit the scene with a serious purpose, he does suggest that it may be 'the turning-point from the affirmative to the critical-ironic part' of the play.

Eur. has fashioned the plot so that the scene's comic mood contrasts sharply both with the previous episode of self-sacrifice and the following report of Iol.'s miraculous rejuvenation. (Incidentally, the resulting sense of dislocation may have contributed to the suspicion that a scene was missing after the choral song at 629.) Yet despite the strong sense of rupture, there are also similarities: the surprise of the daughter's self-sacrifice is followed by that of Iol.'s eager departure for battle (noted by Albini (1993) 108) and so continues the technique of surprise used by Eur. throughout this play and many others: cf. Intro. §2(b). Moreover, just as Heracles' daughter proved her nobility in adversity, so must Iol. prove his loyalty and courage in the face of comic doubts. The Chorus' comment ἀ δ' ἀρετὰ βαίνει διὰ μόχθων ('Excellence comes through toil', 625) applies equally well to both, and each makes a decisive contribution to the survival of the Hcld.

In the first part of the play Iolaus' age and weakness are a source of sympathy, but now they are used to provoke laughter *as well as* pity. While Iolaus' feebleness makes his subsequent rejuvenation on the battlefield all the more miraculous, such a contrast was possible without the comic elements, so why does Euripides now invite our laughter at Iolaus? Rather than seeing the 'ridiculous effect' as an unfortunate and unintended accident (A. Lesky, *Greek Tragic Poetry* (trans. M. Dillon, New Haven, 1983) 263-4), or as a foretaste of the play's ironic ending (Seidensticker, 99-100), I suggest that it encourages the audience to feel affection for Iolaus, while at the same time inviting them to share the servant's gentle irony and amused disbelief, only to reverse this reasonable attitude in the next episode and so magnify the impact of Iolaus' success. The comic elements in the arming scene thus prepare for the climactic triumph of Iolaus and the Heraclidae, which in turn increases the dissonant force of Alcmene's savage and 'illegal' revenge at the end of the play.

681 as we should: a rare personal use of ἔοικα in the sense 'I ought to' (cf. Pl. *Laws* 879c); the regular meaning 'I am like' occurs at 427.

682 like you: for πρός + gen. in the sense 'characteristic of x', cf. *Her.* 585, *Hel.* 950, *Bacch.* 641. **foolish:** the Servant's response to Iol.'s decision is remarkably critical; cf. Barrett

on *Hipp.* 644 'μῶρος is a strongly condemnatory word denoting culpable lack of intelligence.' The Tutor's exclamation at *Med.* 61 ὦ μῶρος, εἰ χρὴ δεσπότας εἰπεῖν τόδε ('Fool, if one can say this of one's masters') is different, since it is partly an expression of pity for Medea. The Servant's attitude towards Iol. recalls the cheeky slaves of comedy; cf. the conversation between Xanthias and Pluto's slave at *Frogs* 738-813, esp. 741-55. By contrast, at *Or.* 1506-28 Eur. gets comic mileage from the Phrygian Slave's excessive obsequiousness. West (on *Or.* 1503-36) comments 'There is no funnier scene in Greek tragedy.'

683-91 For the reordering of these lines, see Zuntz 113-14. Garzya (Teubner) prints Schliack's 683, 688, 687, 684-6, 689-91; the order 683 followed by 688, and 687 followed by 684 is demanded by the sense, but Zuntz (p. 114) is likely to be right about the placing of 685-6 immediately before 691, 'for after the servant's insulting pun (v. 686) Iolaus could not reasonably continue the argument: he must either give in or assert himself by breaking off the discussion.' The transposition was probably caused by the similar beginnings of 684 and 688 (οὐκ ἔστ' ~ οὐκ ἔστιν); cf. Kannicht on *Hel.* 571-82 (p. 163).

683-8 and unlike me too: rather than taking offence at the imputation of foolishness, Iol. adapts the Servant's 'it was unlike you' for his own ends, continuing the aor. infin. construction of 682. **your strength:** Iol.'s desire to engage in 'stout battle' prompts the Servant to remind him that he is a weak old man: cf. 636. **sir:** cf. 321n., Stevens (1976) 43. In Athens hoplites were selected from all eligible male citizens between 18 and 60 years old. While older men would be valued for their experience and their steadying effect on morale, their depleted physical strength was a disadvantage: cf. V. D. Hanson, *The Western Way of War* (Oxford, 1989) 89-95. Although we are never told exactly how old Iol. is, it is repeatedly emphasized that he is physically frail and therefore unfit for combat: cf. 686, 702-3, 729-39.

689 still: for ἀλλ' οὖν ... γε, 'well, at any rate...', cf. *Cycl.* 652, *GP* 442. **no fewer foes than before:** ἀριθμὸν is acc. of respect: lit. 'no fewer (ἐλάσσοσιν, dat. after μαχοῦμαι) in respect of number'.

690 the weight: σήκωμα is a generic term for any weight put in the balance, rather than a particular measure. Here the image of adding weight to one side of the balance represents something positive (for one's friends: φίλοις). By contrast, the scales used by Zeus to measure the fates of men (*Il.* 8.69-74, 22.209-13) sink down on the side of the person fated to die (cf. *Hec.* 57-8).

687-4 Iol. imagines himself as an awesome warrior whose gaze nobody dare return; cf. *Rhes.* 335. The idea of 684 (a terrifying *appearance* cannot kill) is used in earnest at Aesch. *Sept.* 397-9.

685-6 May I too not strike ...? You may strike: Pierson's change of L's σθένοιμι / σθένοις ('I/you may have the strength) to θένοιμι / θένοις is supported not only by 738 (cf. 271), but also by the fact that it gives Iol.'s question a heroic tenor, which the Servant comically undermines. The Servant's wordplay (θένοις ~ πέσοις) prompted Zuntz 29 to speak of 'crude derision and ... almost Aristophanic ridicule', but the absence of malice here makes it significantly different from the generally less restrained manner of comedy.

691-2 Iol. again ignores the Servant's humour and reasserts his intention to fight, only to receive another wry response.

693-4 Iol. finally signals an end to the dialogue but the Servant has the last word and points out that Iol. has no armour! **be sure that I will not be staying:** Diggle 225-6 defends his alteration of L's μενοῦντα to the dative μενοῦντι. The lack of a subject for the acc. μενοῦντα led Kirchhoff to suggest μ' οὐ μενοῦντα (accepted by Kovacs), but Diggle 225 comments 'With the negative μή there can be no quarrel. For its use with a participle in a clause dependent on an imperative (σοι λέγειν πάρα is the equivalent of an imperative) see 983.'

695-701: Greek temples served many purposes, including those now served by arsenals and war museums. The dedication of weapons, either one's own, or, more commonly, those captured from the enemy (cf. 695), was a regular feature of post-war celebration and thanksgiving (cf. e.g. *El.* 6-7, *Tro.* 573-6, Burkert (1985) 94). As Wilkins remarks (on 695-7), Iol.'s action 'reverses the common practice of dedicating personal weapons by a veteran', and also foreshadows his subsequent rejuvenation on the battlefield. The removal of dedicated weapons could be problematic: cf. Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae*, 4. 4 (trans. M. Winterbottom): 'While a certain city was at war, a hero lost his weapons in battle, and removed the arms from the tomb of a dead hero. He fought heroically, then put the weapons back. He got his reward, and is accused of violating the tomb.' Wilkins comments, 'Iolaus' reference to borrowing and return perhaps reflects caution in this area.' But Iol.'s action is unlikely to have appeared impious in this context. Firstly, Iol. borrows the weapons from Zeus to fight against an enemy who has violated the god's sacred enclosure (65ff.), and secondly, he is decisively supported in battle by Zeus and other gods (cf. 766-9, 851-8). Moreover, one would have expected some adverse comment on Iol.'s impiety from the Servant, but he carries out Iol.'s orders without demur.

695 captured weapons: a symbol of the god's aid to local soldiers in the past, and thus a positive omen for Iol.

697 the god will not ask for them back: this should not be read as cynical self-justification: Iol. is confident of Zeus' approval (cf. 695-701n.).

698 from the pegs: cf. *Andr.* 1121-2, where Neoptolemus seizes weapons from the pegs (πασσάλων καθαρπάσας) in the temple of Apollo at Delphi. But even in *Andr.*, where there is a history of hostility between Apollo and Neoptolemus, the impact of the action is not to condemn Neoptolemus as a temple-robber: cf. Allan (381-607n.) 254-6.

700-1 staying at home is shameful: Iol. rejects οἰκούρημα, a word that also means 'housekeeping', which in Greek eyes was the province of women; cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 787, *Hec.* 1277, *Or.* 928-9. **cowardice:** the contrast is between real men, who fight, and womanish men, who stay at home (cf. *Ag.* 1625ff.; contrast *Med.* 248-51).

702-8 As the Servant goes into the temple to fetch the armour, the Chorus offer Iol. advice (for a similar use of mid-episode recitative anapaests, cf. 288-96n.). Like the Servant (688ff.) they stress Iol.'s physical infirmity, and while acknowledging the old man's plucky spirit, they urge him to give up any thought of regaining his youth. Rejuvenation is mentioned here for the first time in the play, but as a paradigm of τὰ ἀμήχανα ('the impossible', 707). Interestingly, the only other tragic scene of rejuvenation also has significant comic elements, as the power of Dionysus makes Cadmus and Teiresias forget their old age (*Bacch.* 187-90). Meanwhile, rejuvenation is a popular motif in Old Comedy and is not limited there to the influence of Dionysus: cf. e.g. *Knights* 1321-5 (Demos boiled down by the Sausage-seller),

Lys. 667-71 (the male Chorus urge one another to slough off their old skin). Nevertheless, there is nothing intrinsically comic about rejuvenation itself, nor should we think of comedy parodying a peculiarly tragic motif, though tragic choruses do sometimes pray pathetically for their youth to be restored (as Iol. does himself, 740-3). Rejuvenation is rather an essentially popular idea that can be handled in a variety of ways and in a variety of genres. While it may have been suggested here by Iol.'s mythical and ritual connections to youth (cf. Intro. §1(b)), its main function (by virtue of being so improbable) is to make Iol.'s divinely sanctioned transformation all the more emphatic (cf. 851-8).

702-3 calmed (στόρνυσι): lit. 'smoothed out'; the metaphor likens Iol.'s spirit to a tempestuous sea. **in the prime of youth:** as his body will be once again (cf. 857-8).

704-5 Yet why ... our city?: the Chorus are proved wrong on both counts (cf. 859-63, 1032-6).

706-7 resist such thoughts: lit. 'fight your opinion'. For the different meanings of γνωσιμαχεῖν ('change one's view' or 'recognize the (state of the) fight'), cf. Dunbar on Ar. *Birds* 555. **at your age:** adverbial accusative.

708 back again: for pleonastic πάλιν αὖθις, cf. 487. The Chorus' natural disbelief in rejuvenation enhances the surprise of the following scene.

709-19 Alc., silent since line 665, adds to the pressure on Iol. to give up his reckless plan.

709 I translate the OCT, but find the punctuation of Zuntz 36 n. 3 preferable: τί χρῆμα; μέλλεις... For as Zuntz comments, 'Alcmene knows why Iolaus is preparing to leave; but she protests.' Translate: 'What's going on? Do you intend ...?' Cf. 646-7n.

710 grandchildren: in support of Vitelli's <τέκνου> ('with my <child's> children') Diggle (OCT apparatus) compares *Andr.* 584, 1063, *Bacch.* 1327-8, *IA* 784; cf. 659n.

711 because battle is men's business: or, with the alternative punctuation (cf. 709n.), 'Yes, for battle is men's business'. Iol.'s words may recall those of Hector to Andromache (*Il.* 6. 492 πόλεμος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει, 'war will be men's concern'). The evocation of this famous speech by an aged Iol. is seen as potentially comic by Seidensticker (680-747n.) 94 n. 13 and as downright absurd by Burnett (1998) 156 n. 61. Whether or not the specific Homeric scene was meant to be recalled (this was a common Greek sentiment), the old man's confidence in his warrior role seems both pathetic and touched with irony.

712 how shall I survive?: Falkner (1989) 119-20 sees here (712-19) a contrast between Iol.'s efforts for the family and Alc.'s more selfish viewpoint, but this detracts from the shock of the final scene: cf. 646-53n. Alc.'s fearfulness stresses the rashness of Iol.'s intentions.

713 your son's remaining children: i.e. the adult sons of Heracles who are currently under the command of Hyllus (cf. 45-7). Kovacs (640n.) 123-4 and (1996) 14-15 argues that a reference to the remaining grandchildren is out of place (for it implies a contrast with dead grandchildren and that Iol. is a grandchild of Alc.), and he suggests emending to τῶν λελειμμένων ('Your grandsons will care for those I have left behind'). However, his objections have been convincingly refuted by Davidson (1996) 243-4. Wilkins' interpretation of the established text ('sc. the children other than the daughter of Heracles') is problematic on other grounds: Iol. is hardly likely to remind Alc. thus of her granddaughter's death, and, as Davidson points out, the contrast implied here would

be with 'the remaining suppliants, namely females and young boys, ... [who are] clearly not in a position to provide any sort of protection for Alcmene'.

714 something happens to them: lit. 'they experience chance', a euphemistic expression for misfortune.

715 have no fear: cf. 654n.

716 indeed: for colloquial γάρ τοι marking agreement, cf. *Or.* 111, Stevens (1976) 48, *GP* 88-9.

718-19 if he is loyal to me: Alc. does not risk openly offending Zeus (contrast Amphitryon, *Her.* 339-47) but does imply that he has been negligent in failing to protect her, though she is the mother of his son, Heracles. By contrast, after the defeat of Eury., she acknowledges Zeus' support for both herself and her son: cf. 869-72.

720-47 The Servant returns from the temple with a panoply for Iol. and resumes their (amusing) dialogue. The scene of a warrior departing for battle with his armour carried behind him is found in *Sept.* 675ff. and *Phoen.* 779-83 (see Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 779). Here, however, the stage-action is given an ironic and irreverent explanation: the Servant carries the armour because Iol. is too weak to do so himself. Taplin (1977) 160 found the avoidance of Iol.'s arming 'most peculiar', but it contributes skilfully to the scene's comic effect.

721 hurry (φθάνοις δ' ἄν οὐκ ἄν): lit. 'you could not be too quick'; the repeated ἄν enhances the Servant's tone of urgency (cf. 415n.). The construction contributes to the dialogue's lively colloquial tone: cf. 633, 641, 646, 688, 709, 716.

722-3 Ares hates delayers: the proverbial ring makes the Servant sound cocky and sententious.

726-8 Iol. instructs the Servant to lead him to the battlefield; the forcefulness of κόμιζε ... ἔνθες ('bring ... put') is undermined by the pathetic ἔπαιρε ... εὐθύνων ('support ... guide'). As Strohm (1957) 21 observes, the altar is a most effective backdrop to Iol.'s decision to enter battle, since it is a great surprise that he should leave the altar in such circumstances (cf. 602-7n.).

729 really: Smyth §2865 notes that ἦ ... γάρ 'often has the force of *am I to understand that* asked with surprise'. **lead the warrior like a child:** an intentionally ludicrous combination: the Servant likens himself to a παιδαγωγός, implying that leading Iol. to battle is like leading a child to school (cf. γέρων γέροντα παιδαγωγήσω σ' ἐγώ; *Bacch.* 193, 'Shall I, an old man, lead you, an old man, like a child?'), where the idea of old men (Teiresias and Cadmus) made young relates to the rejuvenating effects of Dionysiac worship). Iol. does not become a child on the battlefield, but he does regain his youth (857-8).

730 for the sake of the omen: Iol. is not referring to the 'oracle' (406-7) and the girl's presumed death, but simply to the idea that to stumble at the start of a journey may bring bad luck.

733 Tyrwhitt's δοκῶν for L's δοκῶ restores sense with minimum change. For the 'gentle remonstrance' in τοι ('It's you who are slow, you know'), see *GP* 541.

737 being successful, I would hope: an important qualification, showing that the Servant's attitude to Iol. is not harshly cynical but a combination of amusement and bemusement.

738-9 striking some enemy through his shield: Iol. continues to imagine his impact in heroic terms, but the Servant, as usual, punctures his statement with an ironic reply; cf. 685-6n.

739 this is my fear: for φόβος meaning 'object of fear', cf. *Med.* 1257, *Or.* 1518.

740-7 Iol.'s parting speech ends the scene on an interestingly different note. Its tone of epic reminiscence prepares for the non-comic handling of his rejuvenation on the battlefield. By contrast, Burnett (1976) 19 sees the 'comic business' continuing, as Iol. 'rattles his ancient parts and apostrophizes his flabby arm (740)'. However, as Rutherford observes (Penguin trans., 176 n. 28), Iol.'s recollection of his lost youth is marked by pathos, not comedy (for the latter, cf. Ar. *Ach.* 209-18).

740-3 I wish, arm of mine ... in your youth: like Homer's Nestor (e.g. *Il.* 7.157), Iol. poignantly wishes for the strength and heroism of his lost youth; cf. *Her.* 232-5 (Amphitryon wishes he could punish Lycus). For Iol.'s apostrophe 'arm of mine', cf. Easterling on *Trach.* 1089-90, where Heracles 'addresses his arms as if they were old comrades in battle'; also *Alc.* 837-9 (Heracles summons up his strength by addressing his hands and heart), *Phil.* 1004-5. **when you destroyed Sparta with Heracles:** Nestor often refers to specific deeds from his heroic past as well; cf. e.g. his miniature Pylian epic, *Il.* 11.670-762. Heracles sacked Sparta in order to restore the exiled Tyndareus to the kingship (Apollod. 3.10.5). Loraux (Intro. n 110) 374 n. 311 remarks that 'the allusion to the mythical devastation of Sparta by Iolaus (740-743) salves the Athenians' wounded pride'. More specifically, in terms of the action of the play, the fact that Heracles and Iol. are presented as destroyers of Sparta increases the shock of the final scene, where Heracles' descendants, beneficiaries of Athenian mercy, come from Sparta to attack Athens itself (1032-6).

743-4 make Eurystheus flee: it is the flight of Eury. that appropriately provides the context for Iol.'s rejuvenation (841ff.). **too cowardly:** καί emphasizes the following word κακός; cf. 507. κακὸς μένειν = κακίων ἢ ὥστε μένειν. **to face the spear:** Eury. is later said to reject Hyllus' offer of single combat because of cowardice (813-16, ending ἀλλ' ἦν κάκιστος).

745-6 Wealth ... the appearance of courage: in heroic society, where warfare is a major source of wealth, it seems natural to assume that prosperity implies courage. However, as Iol. claims in the case of Eury., prosperity can be deceptive in this respect (cf. *Andr.* 703-5). Eury.'s lack of courage is eventually exposed and his prosperity destroyed (cf. 863 τὸν ὄλβιον πάροιθε). By contrast, Iol.'s εὐψυχία now matches the Maiden's (597).

746-7 the prosperous man knows everything well: Iol. implies that this traditional assumption is mistaken, since Eury. shows that a prosperous man can be both ignorant and cowardly.

748-83: Fourth Song (Third *Stasimon*) of the Chorus.

Iol. departs for battle, led by the Servant. (He does not return to the stage: cf. 929n.) With the fighting now imminent, the Chorus perform a song that combines justification of Athens' position with an appeal for divine support. In the first strophic pair the Chorus present the crisis as the result of Argive arrogance, and call on the gods, especially Zeus and Athena, to help the Athenians, since they are fighting to protect the suppliants. They are confident of the gods' favour: 'Zeus is my ally, I am not afraid' (766-7). In the second strophic pair the Chorus focus on their city's relationship to Athena. They invoke their patron goddess and remind her of the honours paid to her at her annual festival, the Panathenaea. Thus, taken as a whole, the

song asserts both the justice of the Athenians' cause and their record of worship as reasons for the gods to intervene on their behalf. The metre is (like the first stasimon) mainly Aeolic: cf. 353-80n. For the anapaests of 775~782, see Dale (1968) 52. Wilkins 145-6 gives the full scheme; cf. Dale, *MATC* (1981) 78-9.

748-51 the Chorus call on the earth, moon, and sun to be their messengers (for the worship of 'nature deities', and their relation to the gods of poetry, see Burkert (1985) 174-6). The natural elements are often invoked in tragedy as witnesses to the terrible events on stage (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 601, where Hippolytus summons the earth and sky to witness the Nurse's shameful words). Here the appeal to such cosmic powers as messengers highlights the importance of their message. **moon that shines all night:** the description παννύχιος refers here to the moon principally as a constant observer of mankind, but it also suggests the full moon time regularly chosen for festivals; cf. the account of the Panathenaea in the second antistrophe (782-3 παννυχίοις ... κρότοισιν). **the god who brings light to mortals:** for the sun referred to simply as θεός ('the god') when the context is clear, cf. *Pers.* 502-5, *Trach.* 145, *Med.* 352. **bear a message:** ἐνέγκαι is imperatival (aor.) infin.; cf. Smyth §2013, Goodwin §784.

752-4 **shout out:** As Zuntz 116 notes, the idea of the earth, moon, and sun shouting in heaven makes clear 'that a rich, lyrical style is here used to convey a content of high emotional quality'. **the ruler's throne:** the noun ἀρχέτας is used here adjectivally (cf. 699 ὁπλίτην κόσμον): cf. Stevens on *Andr.* 3. For the throne of Zeus as a symbol of his authority in heaven, cf. *Ant.* 1039-41, *Ag.* 1563-4. **bright-eyed Athena:** γλαυκός recalls the Homeric epithet γλαυκῶπις; both the meaning and origin of the words ('blue-grey-eyed', 'owl-eyed') are much debated: see Kirk on *Il.* 1.200, Janko on *Il.* 16.33-5. For the ellipse of ἐν + gen. meaning 'in the house of' [sc. δόμοις], cf. *Alc.* 761, *Hec.* 418, *Ion* 551.

755-8 μέλλω ('I am about to') introduces the 'message' (751) itself; the Chorus speak in the first person on behalf of the Athenians. The repetition of μέλλω stresses the immediacy of the battle and the scale of the risk being run: both their land and their property are at stake. **on behalf of:** ὑπέρ is understood ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with the first noun (γᾶς) as well. **since I have received the suppliants:** the Chorus take care to point out that they are fighting not for their own personal gain, but to defend the rights of suppliants. **cut through the danger:** a remarkable expression, combining the forceful, literal sense of τέμνω ('cut') with the metaphorical undertone of 'cut short, bring to a crisis or decision' (LSJ *s.v.* A.VII): thus 'end the danger with conclusive assurance'. The aor. inf. (τεμεῖν) is regular after μέλλω: cf. 709-10, Stevens on *Andr.* 571.

759-62 **as prospersous as Mycenae:** cf. 362-3. **martial strength:** the Chorus recognize the Herald's proud boast (cf. 156-7, 282-3): the effect is to magnify Athens' courage in choosing to support the weaker side. **cherish anger:** κεύθω ('I conceal') suggests Argive deception; cf. 199-200, 258. **against my land:** the dative with μῆνις ('anger') is rare; cf. *Hipp.* 1146.

763-5 **cowardly** (κακόν)**:** countering κακός at 744; cf. 'I am not afraid' (766). For the disgrace involved in a loss of Athenian sovereignty, cf. 242-6, 262, 286-7. The direct address to the city (ὦ πόλις) focuses Athenian attention on the threat to their independence. **at the command of Argos:** Zuntz 107 called Reiske's κελεύσμασιν Ἄργους (L has καὶ λεύσιμον ἄργος, 'and stoning (?Argos)') one of the 'glories of the critical art'.

766-7 Zeus ... my ... Zeus ... me: the anaphora of Ζεύς μοι, which corresponds metrically to that of μέλλω in 755-6, expresses the Chorus' confidence in the god's support, contrasting with Alc.'s criticism (718-19). For the gods as the 'allies' of mortals, cf. 347-52, where Iol. specifies Athena.

768-9 Never ... mortals: i.e. the Athenians will always honour the gods (and the divinely sponsored rights of suppliants) rather than yield to human demands. **by me:** for ἐκ with the gen. expressing agency, cf. 587, Smyth §1678.

770-2 The Chorus address the goddess directly and ascribe a range of titles to her (mother, mistress, guardian), all of which express her interest in the welfare of Athens (cf. the regular hymnic pattern of invocation followed by cult titles or powers). H. P. Foley, *Ritual Irony: Poetry and Sacrifice in Euripides* (Ithaca, 1985) 20 claims that in the *Hcld.* (as well as the *Suppl.* and *Her.*) 'the city itself becomes a source of salvation alternative to the gods', but this is to overlook the crucial role played by Zeus, Athena, Heracles, and Hebe in the defence of both the suppliants and the city. **my Lady:** the honorific title πότνια ('mistress') is used to address both goddesses and women. The reference here to 'Lady Athena' is immediately clear from the context (cf. Ar. *Knights* 1170), and having spoken of Zeus (766-8), it is appropriate that the Chorus turn in their moment of crisis to Athena, *the* protectress of Athens (cf. 753-4). **yours:** the position of σόν is emphatic. The ties between Athens and Athena are so close as to be (uniquely for a god) embedded in her name (cf. Burkert (1985) 139 with n. 2). **mother, mistress, and protectress:** an emotive tricolon, which captures some of the divergent attributes of Athena, who is both a warrior and a quasi-maternal protectress of Athens. Appropriately, she was also worshipped there as a goddess of victory (cf. 352n., *Phil.* 134).

773-5 send elsewhere: as usual, hymnic invocation is followed by request. The Chorus' petition takes the familiar apotropaic form 'send the evil elsewhere' (cf. *Hel.* 360-1, Bond on *Her.* 650-4).

775-6 Because of my goodness: lit. 'by my goodness' (causal dat.; cf. 474-7n.). An example of their goodness (piety) is given in the next stanza. **I do not deserve** (οὐ ... δίκαιος)**:** cf. οὐ δικαίως ('unjustly') applied to Eury.'s attack (773).

777-83 When asking the gods for help it is natural to remind them of past sacrifices and other honours: cf. *Sept.* 174-80. On the other hand, if the gods have not lent their aid, it is natural to accuse them of betrayal and ingratitude: cf. *Tro.* 1060-80. Thus, to encourage Athena's benevolence towards Athens, the Chorus depict the goddess' major civic festival, the Panathenaea (which every four years became the Great Panathenaea; for the remodelling and expansion of the festival on an international scale in the 560s, cf. Parker (1996) 89-92). They evoke the massive public sacrifices on the altar of Athena (777-8) and the all-night festival (*pannychis*) that preceded them (780-3). Significantly, the audience are reminded of Athens' greatest celebration of civic harmony and power just as the Athenian army does battle off-stage.

779 the waning day of the months: 28 Hecatombaeon, when the procession and sacrifices of the Panathenaea took place. Hecatombaeon (roughly late July/early August) was the first month of the New Year, and the Panathenaea marked the culmination of its festivities. By contrast, Wilamowitz (1882b) 356-9 rejected any reference to the Panathenaea and saw here evidence of a monthly festival instead; moreover, he took

μάτηρ (771-2) to refer not to Athena, but to mother earth. However, as Pearson 147 and Zuntz 121 n. 1 point out, neither claim is convincing: Athena is the obvious addressee of 770-83, and 'mother' is to be understood metaphorically.

780-3 during the *pannychis* Athena was honoured in song and dance by choirs of boys and girls. Such torch-lit celebrations were very impressive: cf. *Bacch.* 485-6 (Dionysus), Pl. *Rep.* 328a (the Athenian festival of the Thracian goddess Bendis). **the windy hill:** the Acropolis (ἠνεμόεις is a Homeric epithet, usually applied to Troy). **cries of joy** (ὀλολύγματα): like ὀλολύζω and ὀλολυγή, this word describes the ritual cries of women (for a detailed discussion, see McClure (474-7n.) 52-4), celebrating victory (or recommending it under Athena's guidance). **resound ... all-night** (παννυχίοις ... ἰαχεῖ): note the echo of the first stanza (παννύχιος ... ἰαχήσατε). Barker (353-80n.) 63-92 provides a detailed account (and translation) of all references to music and song in tragedy.

784-891: Scene Five (Fourth *Epeisodion*): Messenger, Alcmene.

A Messenger enters direct from the battlefield to report the Hcld.'s victory to Alc. As is regular for messengers in Eur. (and Soph.), his entrance is unannounced (cf. Hamilton (474n.) 65 n. 7), but not unexpected by the audience (cf. 784-5n.). I. J. F. de Jong, *Narrative in Drama: The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech* (Leiden, 1991) 65-72 examines 'the messenger as character', and shows that although tragic messengers are usually anonymous, they are never detached from the action of the play, and are far from being 'objective' narrators. Thus the Messenger here is, like the Servant of Hyllus (639), a slave in the household of the Hcld. (cf. 788-9). Such personal connections are variably important to both the tone and impact of many messenger speeches: not only does it explain why the messenger was present to witness the events he reports (cf. 847-8n.), but it also entails his interest in the fate of the main character. That is, because he is personally linked to the protagonist of his narrative, he recounts events for us through sympathetic eyes (cf. the Messenger's heroic presentation of Hyllus (802-10) and Iol. (843-63), contrasted with the cowardly Eury. (813-16)).

The core of the Messenger's speech is the miracle of Iol.'s rejuvenation and the capture of Eury. Miracles, like murders, are typically presented in messenger speeches (cf. *Bacch.* 677-774), not so much as a result of religious or aesthetic constraints as because the tragedians were aware that certain events could be more effectively presented through narration than through on-stage action. Moreover, the messengers' accounts of triumph and defeat, rescue and killing, make for scenes of great emotional impact. (Plato's *Ion* conveys the powerful effect of performance skills - the use of voice, gesture, and emotion - in the recitation of epic. For the similarities between messenger speeches and the perfomances of rhapsodes, see D. Wiles, *Greek Theatre Performance: An Introduction* (Cambridge, 2000) 14-16.) Nearly every surviving tragedy of Eur. has a messenger speech (*IT*, *Hel.*, *Or.* and *Bacch.* have two, and *Phoen.* has four!), suggesting that audiences enjoyed these 'set piece' narrative performances. However, messenger speeches provide more than a mere interlude of animated, exciting story-telling: they are always carefully integrated with the rest of the drama, showing the outcome of actions taken in previous scenes and preparing for the entry (or re-entry) of the major character(s): see J. M. Bremer, 'Why Messenger-speeches?', in J. M. Bremer et al (eds.), *Miscellanea Tragica in Honorem J. C. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam, 1976) 29-48.

784-98: as Stevens notes (on *Andr.* 1070-1165), in Euripidean messenger scenes 'there is always (except in *IA* 415ff.) a passage of dialogue in which at some point the essential news is briefly announced, and in answer to a request for details the main narrative follows.'

784-5 L's text is unsatisfactory: the Messenger is made to allude to his own benefit in the very first sentence. ἐμοί τε τῶιδε poses a grammatical problem too as ὅδε is not found elsewhere in tragedy with the personal pronoun: see Wilkins on 784-7. The neatest proposal is that of Hartung, who transposed the ends of the lines to give δέσποινα, μύθους σοί τε καλλίστους φέρω / κλύειν, ἐμοί τε συντομωτάτους λέγειν (Mistress, I bring you news that is fairest for you to hear, and briefest for me to relate'). Wilamowitz (1882b) 359 called this solution 'grammatically inoffensive, but also completely trivial', yet the sense fits the context well: the Messenger says his news will delight Alc. and not take him long to report, thus leading into the brief summary of victory in 786-7. In any case, despite the textual problems, the arrival of the Messenger is appropriate at this point, since he answers to the audience's sense of expectation, created by the previous scene and choral ode (cf. 755-8n.), concerning the outcome of the battle. **fairest** (καλλίστους)**:** equivalent to καλλινίκους ('[news] of a great victory'); so νικῶμεν ('we are victorious', 786) with explanatory asyndeton. **briefest** (συντομωτάτους)**:** for the motif in a messenger's opening words, cf. *Suppl.* 638-9, Diggle 61 n. 11.

786-7 a trophy ... bearing your enemies' full armour: the *tropaion*, consisting of a wooden frame decked with a set of enemy armour, was set up on the battlefield to mark the spot where the enemy first 'turned' (*trepô*); cf. Pritchett (340n.) Part 2 (1974) 246-75, Virg. *Aen.* 11.5-11. Wiles (1997) 194 proposes that captured weapons are now brought on to the stage 'to transform an image of Zeus Agoraios into Zeus Tropaios'. However, no character ever refers to such a statue on stage (cf. *Hipp.* 113-20, 522-4, *Andr.* 115-16, 246), suggesting that the temple of Zeus (represented by the *skene* building) provides a sufficiently imposing reminder of the god's interest in the action (cf. 695-7, 717-19, 766-8, 867-72).

788-9 this day: for the motif of 'one day' bringing about a major reversal of fortune, see Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 1689. **has brought you great good fortune:** as Wilkins observes of †διήλασεν†, there is no support for 'either the sense or the dependent infinitive of result [L's ἐλευθερῶσαι]' in LSJ's translation (*s.v.* διελαύνω I.b) '[this day] has brought you to the end (sc. of servitude)'. Among the many suggestions (cf. Kovacs (1996) 15-16), the best seems to be that of Diggle 53-4, who suggests διώλβισεν; cf. *Phoen.* 1689. **you are freed:** The use of the perfect (ἠλευθέρωσαι Jackson) stresses that the reward of freedom applies from the present moment onwards (cf. Goodwin §44). Professor Collard suggests that if διώλβισεν *vel sim.* is right, the participle ἐλευθεροῦσα would also give good sense ('... has brought you good fortune, freeing you ...'). Edith Hall (Intro. n. 7) 112 describes Alcmene's offer to free the slave as 'the sole exception to the inescapability of birth status' in extant tragedy; she suggests that such an offer of emancipation would be construed negatively, noting that (112 n. 48) 'the play seems subsequently (esp. 961-82) to be critical of Alcmena's capacity for making sound ethical judgements!' However, gratitiude was an acceptable reason for freeing a slave in fifth-century Athens (cf. Dover (1974) 286-7), and Aristotle was aware, despite his ideas about 'natural slavery', that the prospect of manumission was a strong incentive to good work (Arist. *Pol.* 1330a32-4). The effect of Alc.'s generosity

here is to throw her later vindictiveness into even sharper relief. An additional reason for introducing the manumission motif may be the role it played at the battle of Marathon itself: see 890-1n.

791 **I am afraid whether:** φόβος εἰ for μὴ οὐ: cf. Page on *Med.* 184 'εἰ is justified by the *idea of doubt* in φόβος'.

792 **greatly:** cf. 597-9n.

793 **Is old Iolaus still alive too?:** L's text is faulty since, as Zuntz 122-4 has shown, it is inconceivable that the rejuvenated Iol. could be introduced so casually, or that, if he were on stage here, the Messenger could describe him as still returning from the battle at 861-3. Kovacs (Loeb) accepts Elmsley's ὁ μὲν γέρων οὖν ἔστιν Ἰόλεως ἔτι ('Is old Iolaus then still alive?'), which gives the most likely sense. Elmsley also proposed ἆρ' ... ἔτι (and so did Bothe before him: cf. Diggle 519). Diggle (OCT apparatus) suggests ὁ μὲν γέρων σῶς [or ἔτ'] ἔστιν Ἰόλεως; λέγε ('Is old Iolaus unharmed [/still alive]? Speak'). Also worth considering (since the palaeographic changes are minimal) is Pearson's οὖν ... τάδε ('Does this include old Iolaus?'). Whatever the correct reading, it is clear that Iol. is not present on stage: Alc. is merely asking if he has survived the fighting.

794 **certainly:** cf. 641n.

795 **What?:** the blunt question marks Alc.'s tone of disbelief. Like the Servant in the last scene (cf. 688, 690, etc.) she too doubts Iol.'s capacity for battle: μῶν indicates her surprise at the idea of his fighting effectively (cf. 647-8n.). On the line's formation as a double question, cf. Mastronarde (1979) 49 with n. 53.

796 Alc. has just asked whether Iol. fought well; the Messenger's reply is therefore all the more surprising!

797-8 **an astonishing story** (θαυμάστα): cf. 853 θαύματος ('a miracle'). For the significance of rejuvenation in Greek thought, cf. 851-3n. **But first I want to hear you report:** Alc. provides the cue for the Messenger's narrative speech; cf. 784-98n.

799-866: the Messenger's rhesis describes the entire course of the battle from the initial deployment of the troops to the defeat of the Argives and the humiliating capture of their general. It is carefully constructed in five sections, the third and central one containing an account of the battle itself (830-42). Before it comes Hyllus' rejected offer of single-combat (804-18), followed by the pre-battle sacrifices and other preparations (819-29); after it come the pursuit and capture of Eury., including prayer, epiphany, and miracle (843-63), rounded off by a concluding reflection from the Messenger himself (863-6). The inclusion of three passages of direct speech (804-10, 826-7, 839-40, the latter combining two addressees), and four of indirect (811-12, 828-9, 844-5, 851-3), makes the narrative more vivid for the audience, and allows them to experience the action from a range of perspectives (cf. 804-10n.). Also, as de Jong (784-891n.) 131 n. 36 points out, 'the quotation of speeches is ... meant by the messenger to enhance the authenticity of his story'. Significantly, by foregrounding the speeches and actions of Hyllus and Iol. in particular, the Messenger emphasizes the Hcld.'s contribution to their own salvation, the men's battlefield exploits complementing the non-military heroism of Heracles' daughter.

799 **One speech from me ... to you:** an unusual opening to a messenger speech (the regular opening, 'When ...' (cf. Stevens on *Andr.* 1085), is postponed until the next line): the

Messenger advertises the inclusiveness of his account (cf. 784-5) both as an eye-witness and as a relayer of others' information (847-8).

800-3 face to face: the armies are drawn up for full hoplite engagement, but Hyllus acts like an epic warrior, standing between the opposing troops to offer single combat: cf. *Il.* 7.54-91, where Hector challenges the best of the Achaeans to a duel.

804-10: Like the motif of single combat, the use of direct speech is characteristic of Homeric epic (cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1448a20-2). As de Jong (784-891n.) 132 observes, 'In this respect Euripides is the most Homeric of the Attic tragedians, making use of direct speech every 21 lines [in his messenger speeches], as opposed to every 167 lines for Aeschylus, and every 47 for Sophocles.' Hyllus' direct challenge to Eury. in these lines (and some are missing) is by far the longest speech quoted by the Messenger (cf. 826-7, 839-40). Both the length of the speech and its position foreground the heroism of Hyllus and the subsequent contrast with Eury.

805-6 why can we not let this land ...?: Hyllus implies that things should never have got to the stage where Athens was embroiled in their dispute. But the sense is incomplete and a lacuna must follow. Elmsley suggests <καὶ τὰς Μυκήνας αὖθις εἰρήνην ἄγειν> ('why can we not let this land <and Mycenae be at peace again?>'), but it hard to believe that consecutive lines could begin καὶ τὰς Μυκήνας. Moreover, 806 does not follow on from this very well; more than one line may be missing.

807 by depriving it of men: Pearson defends L's ἀνδρός ('by depriving it of a single life'), but his parallel (*Andr.* 909) does not show that bare ἀνδρός can mean ἑνός ἀνδρός. Hartung's ἀνδρῶν, however, gives excellent sense. Hyllus is characterized not only as a good leader (issuing his challenge before others die) but also as a skilled speaker, appealing here to the Argive soldiers' sense of self-preservation. Unfortunately, Eury. does not seem to care much for their opinion (813).

807-8 one against one: the challenge is marked by anaphora and alliteration (ἐμοὶ μόνος μόνωι / μάχην).

808-10 Hyllus proposes the terms of the duel (cf. *Il.* 3.71-2, 7.77-86). **lead them away** (ἄγου): the middle voice implies 'for yourself', i.e. 'to do with them what you will'.

811-12 the troops approved his speech: i.e. *shouted* their approval (cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.22). **for its release from suffering:** compare the armies' reaction when Menelaus agrees to face Paris in a duel: Ὣς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἐχάρησαν Ἀχαιοί τε Τρῶές τε / ἐλπόμενοι παύσασθαι ὀϊζυροῦ πολέμοιο ('So he spoke, and both Achaeans and Trojans were delighted, thinking that they were done with miserable war', *Il.* 3.112-13); contrast 816n.

813-14 felt no shame: αἰδεσθεὶς applies by zeugma to both τοὺς κλύοντας and δειλίαν. **at his own cowardice:** the repetition αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ stresses the criticism.

815 to come close in hard conflict: lit. 'to come near the mighty spear'.

816 an utter coward: by rejecting Hyllus' challenge Eury. betrays his unheroic nature; cf. 744. Similarly, Menelaus calls the Greek leaders 'women of Achaea' when they react to Hector's offer of a duel with silence and fear (*Il.* 7.92-102).

816-17 And so did such a man ...?: the Messenger concludes his account of the episode with a contei ptuous question; for εἶτα/κἆτα ('and so ...?') marking disbelief and indignation, cf. e.g. *Alc.* 957, *Andr.* 339, *GP* 311.

819 by single combat (μονομάχου δι' ἀσπίδος): cf. 685, *Phoen.* 1325-6.

819-22 L's reading at 822 λαιμῶν βροτείων ('from human throats') has provoked much debate. Various scholars have detected a reference here to the sacrifice of Heracles' daughter (cf. e.g. A. Guzzo, 'Rilettura degli "Eraclidi" di Euripide', in *Studi in onore di L. Castiglioni*, Vol. 1 (Florence, 1960) 423-43, pp. 440-2), but this is out of the question: the daughter of Heracles leaves the stage at 602 to die among women (cf. 565-7), not to be sacrificed among men on the battlefield (see 600-1n.). Wilamowitz (1882b) 339-41 resolved the problem by deleting 819-22; he attributed the lines to a later 'Bearbeiter', who was compensating for the removal of an account of the daughter's sacrifice (cf. similarly Page (221-2n.) 35, Lesky (1977) 231-3). However, there is no reason to believe that any such episode has in fact been cut from the play (cf. Intro. §2(a), 630-747n.).

By contrast, Grube (1941) 170 n. 1 suggests that the sacrifice involves anonymous human victims, not Heracles' daughter, and he contrasts this with 'the more human and civilized attitude of Demophon earlier in the play'. However, it is extremely implausible that the Messenger can be referring in so offhand a manner to the performance of human sacrifice by Athenians. (The theory of Spranger (1925) 123 is particularly far-fetched: he argues that Heracles' daughter is never sacrificed and that Athenian forces take no part in the battle, so that the human sacrifice mentioned here is one performed by the Argive army!) Some (e.g. Pearson, Zuntz 153) prefer to interpret βρότειος as 'gory' (deriving from Homeric βρότος), but the adjective is usually βροτόεις, and as Wilkins reports (on 819-22), 'Collard observes that βρότος ill fits the flow of blood implied by ἀφίεσαν.'

Fortunately, such difficulties disappear if we accept Helbig's βοείων ('of oxen'). This reinstates the regular sacrifice of animals (not humans) before battle, and fits perfectly with 399-400 and 673, where the Athenians are said to be preparing animal victims for precisely this kind of sacrifice. Paley suggested βοτείων ('of sheep', accepted by Kovacs) but this rare word occurs nowhere else in Eur., whereas βόειος is found twice (however, at *Cycl.* 218 it refers to cows rather than oxen). As Wilkins observes, the corruption to βροτείων 'may have arisen by the substitution of a common tragic word (βρότειος) for a rare word'. βρότειος occurs 24 times in Eur.

821 **began to sacrifice:** the imperfect is inceptive (cf. Smyth §1900). **they did not delay:** asyndeton enhances the impression of the seers' haste.

822 **the propitious blood:** as an additional argument against L's βροτείων, Wilkins points out (on 819-22) that 'propitious' is an unlikely word to be applied to human sacrifice (cf. 408-9 (i) n.).

823-4 **brought flank close to flank:** L's ἔκρυπτον gives 'others hid flanks with flanks', but in the hoplite phalanx any 'hiding' or 'covering' is done by shields, not flanks. Diggle 226-8 argues cogently for ἔχριμπτον ('brought close'), since 'The distinctive feature of the hoplite formation is the closeness of man to man'; he compares *Il.* 13.130-1, 16.211-17, Thuc. 5.71.1. Cf. also 836-7.

824-9 Dem. and Eury. encourage the opposing armies to exert themselves in the coming battle. Their appeals to native land and to the fear of disgrace are typical features of military exhortations: cf. e.g. *Il.* 4.242-9, 15.494-9. For the use of similar exhortations in other messenger speeches, see de Jong (784-891n.) 135 n. 50. The Messenger's viewpoint subtly effects how the leaders are presented: Dem.'s speech is quoted, Eury.'s only reported, making Dem.'s message seem more vivid and powerful.

825 as a noble man should: Davie (Penguin) translates 'reminding them of what was expected of men of good stock', but Eur. could have written τοὺς εὐγενεῖς, and εὐγενῆ is more likely to refer to Dem. himself, being part of the Messenger's heroic characterization of the Athenian and Heraclid leaders.

826-7 Fellow citizens: the noun συμπολίτης is recorded only here, but the verb συμπολιτεύω ('I live as a fellow citizen') is used by Thuc. (6.4, 8.47, 73), which suggests that it was a familiar fifth-century term. Its employment by Dem. confirms his depiction as a 'democratic' king (cf. 411-14, 423-4nn.). Moreover, nearly all adult male Athenian citizens were also soldiers or sailors, and so a majority (one presumes) of the theatre audience will have experienced active combat and heard morale-boosting speeches of this kind. **the land that nurtures him and gave him birth:** the image of a nurturing mother earth has a particular resonance for the 'autochthonous' Athenians, whose early king, Erechtheus, was born from the soil of Athens itself (cf. 69n.).

830-1 the Tyrrhenian trumpet: the Greek trumpet 'was not used for musical purposes but only for giving signals, especially ... the signal to attack on the field of battle' (West (73-117n.) 118-19). It was thought to be an invention of the Etruscan king, Tyrrhenus (cf. *Eum.* 567, *Aj.* 17, Virg. *Aen.* 8.526). **gave its shrill signal:** lit. 'when he signalled shrilly with the Tyrrenhian trumpet'. The agent (ὁ σαλπιγκτής), being easily understood from the context, is unexpressed: cf. *Phoen.* 1102-3, Hdt. 8.11, Smyth §931 (c).

832-3 do you think: the use of the second person helps engage the hearer's interest in the action; the effect is heightened by the interrogative. Though such second-person forms in messenger speeches (for a list, see de Jong (784-891n.) 195-7) are addressed to a particular figure (here Alc.), they make the narrative more vivid for the (external) audience of the play as well.

834 the onslaught: 'πίτυλος is a noun of action denoting repeated strenuous movement' (Hutchinson on *Sept.* 855f.); here it refers to the unremitting blows of the Argive army.

836-7 foot ... with foot and man ... against man: the double polyptoton (cf. 555) communicates the density and confinement of the action. For the closeness of Greek hoplite combat, cf. Thuc. 5.71.1, J. Lazenby, 'The Killing Zone', 87-109 in Hanson (399-401n.), p. 96.

838 Many fell: the simplicity of the phrase is affecting. **there were two cries of encouragement:** L. Dindorf's δύο κελεύσματα is a very persuasive conjecture. The other suggestions in the apparatus also give good sense: either 'there were two cries of encouragement' (Haupt's clever dual) or 'there were [two] cries of encouragement at once' (Murray). In any case, the meaning of the line is sufficiently clear and there is no need to propose a lacuna after it (as did Kirchhoff). For the shouting, cf. *Suppl.* 701-2.

839-40 ward off disgrace: the rival cries are run together as both sides exploit the warriors' fierce anxiety not to bring the shame of defeat upon their homeland (cf. 824-9n.).

841-2 with ... much toil: emphatic litotes (cf. 386). The whole sentence has a crescendo effect.

843-5 seeing Hyllus ... mass: with the battle now won, the Messenger switches from the army's viewpont (cf. 835 'broke our lines', 842 'we put to flight) to that of 'old Iolaus'. This is the Messenger's first reference to Iol., his performance in the pitched battle being less important than his remarkable transformation after it. **stretched out his right hand and begged:** the right hand is always used in full acts of supplication as well: cf. Friis-Johansen and Whittle on Aesch. *Suppl.* 193, Gould (1973) 76-7. **to bring him aboard**

his chariot: for ἐμβαίνω with double accusative, cf. *Cycl.* 466-7, *IT* 742. The second acc. derives from the acc. of motion; contrast the double acc. of 852-3.

846-7 Taking the reins ... Eurystheus: Iol. continues as the subject of the new sentence, taking over control of the reins from Hyllus (cf. 859-60). As Wilkins observes (on 843ff.), it is 'not certain ... that Hyllus remains in the chariot'. It would be fitting if the soon to be rejuvenated Iol., once the charioteer of Heracles (cf. Intro. §1(b)), should now ride together with his son, but Hyllus disappears from the narrative here, and it is Iol. who captures Eury. For Iol.'s skill as a horseman and charioteer, cf. Pind. *Isthm.* 1.16-7, 5.32, 7.9. **pressed on after** (ἐπεῖχε)**:** an epicism; cf. *Od.* 22.75, *Bacch.* 1130-1.

847-8 from others' reports: although the Messenger admits that he did not see the epiphany and miracle with his own eyes, he clearly does not mean to imply that Iol.'s rejuvenation was nothing more than fantastic hearsay. Indeed, the fact that others (plural) witnessed the event helps corroborate its truthfulness. Grube (1941) 172 is more literal: the Messenger reports the words of others because 'he is a foot soldier while the Argive king is only captured after a long pursuit by chariot'. As Wilkins notes, a similar change from autopsy to reliance on others' reports is found in other 'encounters with the divine'. **I saw it for myself:** the Messenger's claim to the trustworthiness of an eye-witness is a typical feature of such speeches (cf. de Jong (784-891n.) 183-4).

849-50 the sacred hill of divine Athena, goddess of Pallene: Eury. is to be thought of as fleeing southwards from the Marathon region, rounding the southern edge of Mt. Pentelicon and passing through Pallene, a deme approximately 8 miles east-north-east of Athens (for a detailed map of the Attic demes, cf. Whitehead (1986) xxiii, Parker (1996) xxviii-ix). According to Hdt. 1.62, the Athenians had been defeated by Pisistratus at the temple of Athena Pallenis in the sixth century. Here, by contrast, Pallene is presented as the site of a grave that will protect Athens (1030-1). Eury. is finally caught at the Scironian rocks (859-60) close to the Isthmus (cf. 278-9n. Quite a chase! The distance from Pallene to the Scironian rocks is roughly 40 miles). Eur. has a particular reason for bringing Eury. to both the Scironian rocks and Pallene: see 859-60, 1030-1nn.

851-3 prayed to Hebe ... that he become young: as the personified goddess of 'youthfulness' (ἥβη), Hebe is the appropriate recipient of such a prayer, but equally significant is her role as the bride of the deified Heracles: 856-7n. Hebe was linked in cult to Iol. and Alc. at Cynosarges in Attica (cf. Whitehead (1986) 183 n. 35), and to Alc. and the Hcld. at Aixone (cf. Whitehead (1986) 207, Wilkins (1990a) 337 n. 101). Fittingly, Iol. makes his prayer at the very spot where the defeated Eury. will be buried (1030-1). **for a single day:** cf. 788-9n. **exact punishment from his enemies:** In regaining his youth and punishing Eury., Iol. becomes for a short time like Heracles himself. The youthfulness of both heroes is suggested by 856-8. For the combination of physical renewal and revenge, Burnett (1998) 157 n. 64 well compares Laertes in *Od.* 24.365-71, 520-5.

853 a miracle: Seidensticker (680-747n.) 100 argues that the comic representation of Iol. in the previous scene makes it impossible for the audience to take his miraculous rejuvenation seriously. But in fact the comedy heightens the impact of Iol.'s renewal, as the amusing and pathetic old man is suddenly seen in an unexpectedly heroic light (cf. 702-8n.). Detestation of old age is a topos of Greek literature (e.g. Mimn. fr. 5 W, *Suppl.* 1080-6, 1108-13, *Her.* 637-54) and rejuvenation is always presented as a

thoroughly positive transformation, whether literal or metaphorical (cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 605-6).

854-7 divine epiphanies are found in Greek religion from Mycenaean times onwards (Burkert (1985) 40-4), and gods revealing themselves to humans on the battlefield are not merely a feature of poetic narrative but a widespread element in reports of warfare in the fifth century and beyond: cf. Pritchett (340n.) Part 3 (1979) 11-46, Dover (1974) 133-8. **two stars:** Heracles and Hebe do not appear in anthropomorphic form but as heavenly bodies. For saviour gods manifested as stars, cf. *Hel.* 140, 1497-9 (the Dioscuri). In both Greek and Latin literature epiphanies are often accompanied by a powerful light of some kind (e.g. Prop. 4.6.29-30: Apollo at Actium, with lightning). **hid the chariot in a shadowy cloud:** contrast the baleful mist in which Apollo hides himself before striking Patroclus, *Il.* 16.790.

856-7 those more skilled about such things: the Messenger reports the account of others without discrediting his own (cf. 847-8n.). By implying that his sources are knowledgeable about epiphanies he endorses their identification of the stars. **your son and Hebe:** after his deification Heracles' marriage to Hebe brought him eternal youth and reconciliation with Hebe's mother, Hera (917-18n.). The news of their appearance together confirms the divinity of Heracles in the opinion of Alc. (871-2) and the Chorus (910-18).

857-8 the youthful mould of his young arms: echoing Iol.'s wish at 740-3 and showing it to have been effective.

859-60 captured: as de Jong (784-891n.) 42-3 notes, the historic present (αἱρεῖ) 'throws into relief the climax of Iolaus' pursuit of Eurystheus, which is itself the climax of the battle between the Heraclids + Athenians and Argives'. **the Scironian rocks:** located on the Saronic coast in Corinthia, the Scironian rocks are an apt location for the capture of a criminal threatening Athens, because they were named after the robber Sciron whom Theseus killed on his journey from Troezen to Athens. (Eur. wrote a satyr-play, *Sciron*, based on the myth: cf. N. Pechstein, *Euripides Satyrographos. Ein Kommentar zu den Euripideischen Satyrspielfragmenten* (Stuttgart, 1998) 218-42.) According to later sources, the tomb of Eury. was located near the Scironian rocks: cf. Paus. 1.44.10, Intro. §1(d). If this tradition post-dates Eur., it may have been influenced by Eury.'s capture there in the *Hcld.* Alternatively, if Eur. knew of it, he is probably acknowledging Eury.'s links with the area, while locating his burial elsewhere. In any case, Eury. is to be buried at Pallene, which was almost certainly the site of hero-cult to Eury. at the time of the play's performance: cf. 1030-1, 1040-1nn.

861-2 the finest offering from the booty: for ἀκροθίνιον, cf. Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 203 '"choicest offering", the best chosen from a gathered heap. It is uncertain whether the notion originated with heaps of harvested crops or heaps of war-booty.' Cf. also Hornblower on Thuc. 1.132.2.

863-6 almost every Euripidean messenger speech ends with a concluding evaluation by the speaker. For the general and/or specific reflection found in them, cf. de Jong (784-891n.) 191-2. Such remarks serve to put the events narrated in a wider moral context and also imply a judgement about them. So, here, the Messenger's reflection on the fragility of human fortune highlights the arrogance of Eury. Cf. 608-17.

865-6 who seems to enjoy good fortune: cf. 746-7. The sentiment 'call no man happy until he is dead' is proverbial, e.g. Hdt. 1.32.7; cf. Fraenkel on *Ag.* 928-9.

867 O Zeus, turner of battle: for Zeus Tropaios, cf. 786-7, 936-7nn.

869-70 O Zeus ... finally: Alcmene's slightly guarded acknowledgement of Zeus' support (cf. 718-19) contrasts with the Chorus' joyful address to him (867-8; cf. 766-9). Nevertheless, she recognizes his assistance and expresses her thanks, so to detect criticism of her character here would be rather too ingenious.

871-2 As the son of a mortal mother, Heracles' fate would normally have been no different from that of other semi-divine heroes (Achilles, for example: *Od.* 11.473-540) who lived as shades in the underworld (for Heracles' mortality, cf. *Il.* 18.117-19). Yet by the sixth century at the latest Heracles was being worshipped as a god (and not just as a hero): cf. *IG* I^2 825. (Indeed, if *Od.* 11.602-4 are genuine (for a defence, see A. Heubeck on *Od.* 11.601-27), belief in Heracles' deification may date back to the early seventh century; but cf. West on Hes. *Theog.* 947-55.) For the worship of Heracles as a ἥρως θεὸς ('hero-god', Pind. *Nem.* 3.22) throughout Attica, and especially at Marathon, cf. Intro. §5. The uniqueness of Heracles' fate is emphasized by Alc.'s previous disbelief. (For Heracles as both hero and immortal Olympian, cf. A. D. Nock, 'The Cult of Heroes', in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, vol. II, ed. Z. Stewart (Oxford, 1972) 575-602, pp. 576-7.)

873-5 now ... now ... free ... free: the double anaphora marks Alc.'s excitement on the children's behalf. **the accursed Eurystheus:** Wilkins (on 874) remarks 'The colloquialism is unique to tragedy here and perhaps indicates a certain decline in Alcmene from the heroic principles of the daughter of Heracles and Iolaus, a decline that will continue.' But cf. Stevens (1976) 15 'The use of the simple verb [ὀλουμένου for ἀπολουμένου], normal in poetry, may make the phrase slightly less colloquial.' Regardless of how colloquial the phrase is, it is certainly vigorous and points to Alc.'s intense hatred of Eury., although her moral decline fully emerges only in the final scene: cf. 879-82, 928-1055nn.

875-8 Alc. envisages the *nostos* of the Hcld. to Argos, as both Iol. and the daughter of Heracles had done (cf. 310-15, 586-8), but now with more certainty of its fulfilment. **take possession of:** 'ἐμβατεύσετε is the *vox propria* at law for taking possession of property in pursuance of a claim of right' (Pearson). **ancestral gods, from whom you were barred:** such gods were guardians of inheritance-rights and citizenship. The Hcld.'s exclusion from them marks their loss of *civic rights*, an 'anachronism' that directly engages the fifth-century Athenian audience.

879-82 with what clever motive ...?: Alc. is puzzled by Iol.'s decision to spare Eury. The fact that messenger speeches often recount disasters, and are followed by the entrance of the corpse, heightens the surprise of Eury.'s being captured and led back alive. (For question and answer after the main messenger speech, cf. *Suppl.* 750-77.) κεύθων ('having something deep within') is not so much critical of Iol.'s 'concealment' (cf. 762) as curious about his undeclared intentions. **in my judgement:** cf. 369-70n. Alc. suggests a 'clever' motive for Iol. (sparing one's enemies from death) but roundly rejects it: 'this is no clever thing'. Her position is typical of traditional revenge morality. As such it is unexceptionable, but additional factors complicate, and discredit, her stance in the final scene, where it is revealed that Eury. is a prisoner of war whose execution is forbidden by Athenian *nomos* and the will of its leaders (cf. 961-74).

883-4 out of respect for you: τὸ σόν, sc. σε; cf. *Med.* 312, 460. προτιμῶν: Iol. has put Alc's τίμη (the right to see her son's enemy beaten and captive) before his own τίμη of

executing Eury. at once. **see him with your own eyes:** the pleonasm ὀφθαλμοῖς ἴδοις emphasizes the (pleasurable) act of seeing (one's enemy brought low): cf. 887 ἐς σὸν ἐλθεῖν ὄμμα, where the focus is on Eury.'s shame at being seen. **present:** L's κρατοῦντα ('ruling') is impossible, unless νιν (883) is Iol.! Reiske's κρατοῦσα involves minimal change and gives good sense, referring to Alc. as the 'ruler', as she herself does in the following scene (cf. 944), but the sudden change of construction after καί seems unacceptable. The neatest solution is Collard's παρόντα (*CR* 36 (1986) 22). The fact that Eury. struggles to escape ('not willingly ... but with force', 885-6) may tell against the suggestions of Herwerden and Cobet (see apparatus), which describe Eury. as 'fearful' and 'cowering'. These are also at odds with his actual demeanour on stage (cf. esp. his opening words: 983-5). Of course, the Messenger could be predicting a cowardly entry out of sheer personal bias (cf. 816-17), creating an impression of Eury. which is then overturned in the following scene; for Eur.'s use of surprise throughout the play, cf. Intro §2(b).

885-6 yoked him to necessity: for the common metaphor, which well expresses the powerlessness of the 'yoked' human, cf. *Or.* 1330, *IA* 443, *Phil.* 1025, Fraenkel on *Ag.* 218, Barrett on *Hipp.* 1389-90.

887 he did not want to come before your eyes alive: cf. B. Williams, *Shame and Necessity* (Berkeley, 1993) 78 'The basic experience connected with shame is that of being seen inappropriately, by the wrong people, in the wrong condition.' Thus Eury.'s reluctance is understandable: he will be seen by his bitterest enemies (the wrong people), defeated and captured in battle (the wrong condition). **pay the penalty:** like Alc., the Messenger views Eury.'s death as imminent: neither of them is yet aware of the Athenian *nomos* against executing prisoners (963-6).

889-90 what you first said ... set me free: for the significance of Alc.'s promise, cf. 788-9n.

890-1 for the moral maxim at the end of a messenger's speech, cf. 863-6n. Here the Messenger's general claim has an ironic relationship to the action, since the portrayal of Alc. as 'noble' and 'without deceit' is shockingly subverted in the following scene. As Edith Hall points out (cf. 788-9n.), this is the only example of a manumitted slave in Greek tragedy. Is there a particular reason for such an event here? In 490 the Athenian Assembly passed a decree sending an army to Marathon and granting freedom to the slaves who fought there: cf. D. M. MacDowell (ed.), *Demosthenes: On the False Embassy* (Oxford, 2000) 337-8, Arist. *Rhet.* 1411a10, Paus. 7.15.7. As K.-W. Welwei shows in his brilliant study of slaves in Greek warfare (*Unfreie im antiken Kriegsdienst, Erster Teil* (Wiesbaden, 1974) 22-36), the battle of Marathon was the first time that emancipated slaves fought in the Athenian army. According to Paus. 1.32.3, the fallen slaves were buried on the battlefield (an exceptional mark of honour), but, significantly, they were buried apart from the free Athenians and together with the Plataeans (for the site of their joint burial mound, excavated near Vrana, see the map at *CAH* IV 509). Moreover, all Athenian descriptions of the battle (including Herodotus, our oldest source), ignore the contribution of the emancipated slaves: Marathon quickly became a victory of near mythical dimensions, with a few free Athenians defeating great hordes of barbarians, and any reference to freed slaves on the Athenian side (some of them perhaps even *barbaroi* themselves by origin) would not have suited this most famous victory of the free Athenian citizen-soldier. In other words, the slaves of Marathon (and, to a lesser extent, the Plataeans) were simply written out of Athenian history. (We see a

similar process of selection at Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.24, where the emancipation of the slaves who rowed the Athenian ships at the battle of Arginusae in 406, a well-known event (cf. Ar. *Frogs* 33-4, 190-1, 693-6), is entirely overlooked.) Importantly, the freeing of the slaves before Marathon was the result of an exceptional national emergency and no other emancipations of slave-hoplites (as opposed to slave-rowers) are recorded for the classical period. In this respect, as in many others, Marathon remained a unique event in Athenian history and the Hcld.'s manumitted slave, who has just fought alongside the Athenians at Marathon, may allude to it, though here the slave is freed after the battle, not before it. If there is such a reference, Eur. may be reminding his Athenian audience of the debt they owed to former slaves within their own community and may even be providing a mythical parallel for their decision. Cf. also Intro. §5.

892-927: Fifth Song (Fourth *Stasimon*) of the Chorus.

The Messenger has reported the outcome of the battle. Now the Chorus celebrate the victory and reflect on its causes, emphasizing the justice and piety of Athens and its bond with the family of Heracles. Like the other odes in the play, this final song is remarkably clear and uncomplex. In the opening strophe the Chorus express their joy at the Hcld.'s change of fortune. Athens itself is the focus of the antistrophe, where the Chorus declare that events have vindicated the city's conduct. In the second strophe they address Alc. directly (911-12), cheering her with the thought of her son's deification. Finally, the antistrophe combines the various themes of the first three stanzas (the gods' regard for justice, the consequences of hybris, the divinity of Heracles) in order to justify Athena's support for the Hcld. and her humbling of Eury. The metre is (like the first and third stasima) mainly Aeolic: cf. 353-80n. For the full scheme, see Wilkins 169; cf. Dale, *MATC* (1981) 80.

892-7 the Chorus employ the widespread poetic device known as the priamel. One of its most characteristic forms is 'A is good, B is good, but particularly good is C'. Here A (the pleasure of dancing, 892-3) and B (Aphrodite, 894-5) are a foil to the climactic component C (the Hcld.'s good fortune, 895-7), whose various aspects are elaborated in the following stanzas.

892-3 For me the dance is sweet: the point is given particular emphasis by the fact that the Chorus are dancing as they sing. **the clear-sounding charm of the flute:** for the lotus-pipe, cf. Cropp on *El.* 716. **has blazed up in it:** L's nonsensical and unmetrical reading (ἐνὶ δαΐ) has prompted a huge array of conjectures (see Wilkins). I adopt Diggle's ingenious ἐνδέδαεν ('has blazed up [in it]'); Diggle 11-12 gives many parallels for the metaphor. Also worth considering is Stinton's ἐν δ' ἀοιδαί (cf. 780), which he translates as 'when the lovely pipe rings clear, and there are songs besides' (T. C. W. Stinton, *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* (Oxford, 1990) 292).

894-5 and sweet is Aphrodite when she is kindly: Wilkins (on 892-7 and 894) sees here explicit reference to the marriage of Heracles and Hebe, but he seems to exaggerate the hymeneal content of the opening stanza (cf. 915-18). The Chorus are thinking of love and sex, and the pleasures of music and dance, in general (for the convivial language, cf. M. G. Fileni, 'Il quarto stasimo degli Eraclidi di Euripide (vv. 892-927)', in B. Gentili and F. Perusino (eds.), *Mousike: Metrica, ritmica e musica greca in memoria di Giovanni Comotti* (Pisa, 1995) 185-218, pp. 189-94). It is, by contrast, the climactic element (the prosperity of friends) which has specific relevance to the action.

895-7 friends who formerly seemed unfortunate: i.e. the Hcld., whose rise mirrors Eury.'s fall. For the contrast with Eury., and for εὐτυχεῖν, here understood with δοκούντων, cf. 865.

899-900 for the instability of fortune, and the crucial role of the gods and *moira* in human affairs, cf. 608-14. **giver of completion:** the adjective is found only here, though epithets ending in -δότειρα are regularly applied to gods: see Hutchinson on *Sept.* 977. Cf. also Griffith on *P V* 511 μοῖρά ... τελεσφόρος ('completion-bringing fate'). Personified Fate was a recipient of chthonic cult (for the three Fates, daughters of Zeus and Themis, cf. Hes. *Theog.* 904-6). **Life, child of Time:** in Homer αἰών is the vital force that gives men life (cf. J. N. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul* (Princeton, 1987) 15-16). Wilamowitz (on *Her.* 669) distinguishes between relative time (αἰών) and absolute time (χρόνος), αἰών being time relative to human experience, i.e. lived time or simply 'life'. Yet Chronos is presented here as more than a pure abstraction (absolute Time): he is the father of Aion and both are personified (cf. *Suppl.* 787-8). The effect is gnomic and impressive. The worship of Aion in cult, however, seems to be a much later development.

903 honouring the gods: cf. 777-83, where the Chorus use the city's piety to win Athena's support. Cf. also Dem.'s concern about the gods (238-9, 258).

904-6 drives close to madness: the metaphor comes from chariot-racing, where touching the turning-post, or the walls of the racecourse, with the chariot wheels might lead to disaster: cf. *Il.* 23.334-43, Soph. *El.* 720-63. **these proofs:** i.e. the intervention of Heracles and Hebe, which also reveals the support of Zeus and Athena (cf. 766-75), since Iol. prayed to Zeus and the epiphany occurred at Athena's shrine (849-53).

906-9 a very clear message: for Euripides' use of ἐπίσημος ('such that there is a conspicuous (imposed) mark'), cf. Willink on *Or.* 249-50. **always depriving the unjust of their pride:** the gen. τῶν ἀδίκων is possessive with φρονήματος. Although the statement is general, it evokes the fate of Eury., whose arrogant attempt to undo the proper religious conduct of Athens (cf. 362-70) has ended in his defeat and capture with divine assistance.

910-18 the Chorus reflect at greater length upon the epiphany of Heracles and Hebe (cf. 905-6), asserting his divinity and celebrating their marriage.

910-11 Your son has entered into heaven: for Heracles' deification, see 871-2n. He was worshipped as both hero and god throughout Attica: cf. Intro. §5. The periphrastic perfect (εἰμί + perfect participle: ἔστιν ... βεβακὼς), 'expresses more fully the continuance of the *result* of the action of the perfect to the *present* time' (Goodwin §45): i.e. the Chorus stress for Alc. that her son now lives in heaven as a god. (Such periphrastic forms are more typical of Sophocles: cf. A. C. Moorhouse, *The Syntax of Sophocles* (Leiden, 1982) 205-6.)

912-14 the Chorus deny that Heracles entered Hades after being cremated (for the tradition of a mortal Heracles in Homer, cf. 871-2n.). However, there is some dispute whether their words also imply Heracles' apotheosis from the pyre itself (cf. *Phil.* 727-9 and (possibly) *Trach.* 1191ff.). Stinton (892-3n.) 481-2, 502 argues that the Chorus may simply be rejecting the story of Heracles' death on the pyre in favour of his apotheosis (at some unspecified time and place). Yet the way the Chorus express their opinion (φεύγω λόγον: cf. 912n.) is typical of

places where different versions of a myth are being rejected or endorsed, and the foregrounding of the pyre ('his body consumed in the terrible flame of the fire') suggests there might be some background reference to Heracles' apotheosis from it. The impression is strengthened by the fact that the stanza begins with Heracles 'entering heaven' and ends with him in Hebe's 'hall of gold': some reference to his translation there from the pyre seems appropriate.

912 I reject the story: Elmsley's φεύγω is preferable to L's φεύγει ('he escapes the report that ...'; cf. Pind. *Ol.* 6.6-7) because it 'gives an expression of disbelief of a well-known type, ... [relating to λόγος as] a rejected γνωμή or version of myth' (Stinton (892-3n.) 482 n. 94, who compares *Suppl.* 195, *Her.* 1346, *Hel.* 21).

913-14 a possible reference to Heracles' self-immolation on the pyre at Mt Oeta (near Trachis in central Greece). The story of Heracles' cremation there was as an aetiological myth explaining his cult: see P. E. Easterling, *Sophocles: Trachiniae* (Cambridge, 1982) 9-10. The Oetaeans held a festival in honour of Heracles every four years: cf. Schol. bT on *Il.* 22.159, Burkert (1985) 210.

915-16 lies in: lit. 'touches (with the skin)'; for the erotic connotations of χροΐζω, cf. Friis-Johansen and Whittle on Aesch. *Suppl.* 790; also Eur. *Suppl.* 1021. For Hebe in Attic cult, cf. 851-3n. **the hall of gold:** for the symbolic significance of metals in Greek thought, cf. West on Hes. *WD* 109 'Gold is the metal of the gods, not only rare and precious but spotless and incorruptible.'

917-18 O Hymenaeus: the Chorus evoke the ritual cry Ὑμὴν ὦ Ὑμέναιε ('Hymen, O Hymenaeus'), traditionally sung at weddings (for the various forms of the cry in surviving poetry, cf. Gow on Theoc. 18.58); contrast the spirit of *Tro.* 310-41, where Cassandra invokes the god to bless her 'marriage' to Agamemnon. **you honoured two of Zeus' children:** despite being half-siblings, the lives of Heracles and Hebe were very different owing to the circumstances of their conception: Hebe's mother was Hera, but she persecuted Heracles from birth as the offspring of Zeus' encounter with Alc. Their marriage thus marks the end of Hera's jealous rage and is a fitting reward for the now immortal Heracles. The wedding appears in art from the early sixth century onwards: cf. Carpenter (8n.) 134, R. Vollkommer, *Heracles in the Art of Classical Greece* (Oxford, 1988) 37-9.

919-27 the Chorus compare Athena's past support for Heracles with her current defence of the Hcld., notably identifying the actions of the city with the will of the goddess (922-5). Their song ends with a decisive and personal statement rejecting Eury.'s conduct (cf. the reference to Eury. at the end of the first antistrophe).

919-20 Many things agree for many people: or, taking πολλοῖς as neut. rather than masc., 'many things agree with many others'. Pearson prefers the latter and paraphrases 'the world is full of coincidences' (but the Chorus' point is that Athena's help now is no coincidence!), while Kovacs (Loeb) accepts Paley's δὲ for τὰ and translates 'Many things correspond with one another'. However, both the context (speaking of the Hcld.) and other uses of the polyptoton (e.g. Aesch. *Suppl.* 450-1, *Med.* 579) make reference to other *people* rather more likely. Wilkins skilfully retains the force of τὰ: 'things correspond for the most part for many people'. Davie paraphrases 'Many a time men's lives are bound up with one another.' As Paley himself put it, 'These words are obscure.'

920-2 Athena helped these children's father: At *Il.* 8.362-9 Athena recalls how, during Eury.'s persecution of Heracles, she helped the hero with his labours many times (μάλα πολλάκις). But since Athena is speaking to Hera, she takes care to point out that it was Zeus who sent her! Athena's help for Heracles and his children is balanced by Heracles' own help for Athena's father: Heracles joined her in fighting for Zeus against the Giants (cf. Ibycus fr. 298 *PMG*). In *Her.*, where the labours take place before Heracles kills his children, Athena still appears to prevent the crazed hero from killing his father (1001-1008).

924-5 the man for whom violent anger took the place of justice: the Chorus refer to Eury. just before his entry; for this type of preparation in tragedy, cf. Mastronarde (1979) 100 with n. 13. Ironically, the Chorus now forcefully endorse a standard of conduct that both they and Alc. fail to live up to in the final scene: cf. 928-1055, 961-74, 1021, 1052, 1053-5nn.

926-7 the Chorus' final comment, though phrased as a personal wish, again has a specific reference to Eury.'s character, not least in the reuse of φρόνημα (cf. 907-8). **thought and character:** for the semantic range of φρόνημα ('thought', 'spirit', 'pride', etc.) and ψυχή ('life-breath', 'soul', 'character', etc.), see Fraenkel on *Ag.* 739, Griffith on *Ant.* 175-7, 458-60. **insatiable:** the word is primarily emphatic variation on θυμὸς βίαιος (925) but may also refer to the fact that, not satisfied with ruling Argos, Eury. had wanted to dictate Athenian policy as well: cf. 197-8, 261-2, 286-7.

928-1055: Scene Six (*Exodos*): Servant, Alcmene, Chorus, Eurystheus.

The final scene is remarkable for its striking use of surprise: the battle has been won and the Hcld. saved, but the entry of the captive Eury. leads to a radically different view of both him and Alc. Tormentor and victim change places, and, in a movement characteristic of Euripidean tragedy, our sympathy for the former victim is frustrated by the nature of her revenge (cf. *Med.*, *Hec.*). As Collard (134-287n.) 158-9 observes, 'Euripides brings out the repellent vindictiveness of Alcmena by showing her ride down the moral objection that she flouts the law (of Athens, where they now are), which forbids the execution of captives.' Alc., who so far has proved a keen defender of her grandchildren (cf. 646-53, 788-9nn.), now appears as a ruthless and unforgiving executioner whose ethics of revenge are out of step with her new situation: cf. 879-82, 961-74nn.

The attempts of various critics to defend Alc.'s conduct are unconvincing. Burnett (1976) 24, for example, argued that 'Alcmena, as she attempts to destroy this man, is no more like him than Demophon was like the herald he opposed', but this is to overlook the crucial differences between the two confrontations. More recently, but no less implausibly, Burnett (1998) 145 has claimed that 'Alcmena is proposed as a justice-bearing avenger after the pattern of her hero son, and that this strange piece is a whole and successful Fourth Play, like *Alcestis*, to end a day of tragedy.' Yet this approach denies one of the most important aspects of the play's final scene, namely that Alc., who now possesses the power of life and death once wielded by Eury., fails to act any differently from the Argive king and seeks to kill him, even in the face of an Athenian *nomos* protecting prisoners of war.

Moreover, Alc.'s revenge does not reflect critically on her alone, although this is generally ignored even by critics who recognize the play's disturbing close. Wilkins (1990b) 186, for example, notes Alc.'s role as a representative of 'those Heraclidae who will be the ancestors of the Spartans, the future aggressors against Athens', but he does not consider there

to be any implied criticism of Athens itself, despite the fact that the Athenian Chorus agree to Alc.'s plan (cf. 1021, 1052, 1053-5nn.). So while Alc. is indeed shockingly at fault for failing to respect the laws of her protectors, the collaboration of the Chorus is in its own way deeply disturbing. Seidensticker (680-747n.) 100 well expresses the force of the play's unsettling finale: 'What looks for a long time like a patriotic history play, or a glorification of Athenian politics at the start of the Peloponnesian War, suddenly turns out to be a fundamentally deeper, bitter analysis of political ethics.'

928-40: the Servant of Hyllus returns from the battlefield, leading the captive Eury. It is fitting that the character who most doubted Iol.'s effectiveness as a fighter (cf. 682-739) should now return with the ultimate symbol of his victory.

929 we come bringing you this man: a surprise, since the Messenger had suggested that Iol. would lead Eury. in himself (861-3). The Servant soon explains why Iol. and Hyllus have not returned as expected (936-7), and there are good dramatic reasons for keeping Iol. off-stage: one avoids risking bathos by depicting the result of a miracle, and since there are already three speaking parts (Servant, Alc., Eury.), Iol. does not remain a silent character. In addition, the absence of Iol. and Hyllus allows Alc. to overturn the (lower class) Servant's objections to her plan without their intervention.

930 unexpected: ἄελπτον is to be construed ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with both nouns.

932 baleful: Pearson understood πολύπονος here to mean 'consisting of many rank and file', while Wilkins suggests 'experienced in war', but the required sense is 'bringing much woe' (cf. 933-4, *Or.* 1012, *Hel.* 199).

933-4 his arrogance exceeding justice: for the phrasing, cf. 258, 386, 908-9, 979.

934-5 fate: δαίμων here stands for the nameless divine power that controls a man's destiny; cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 1111-14. **reversed his fortune completely:** lit. 'reversed his fortune and changed it.' Pearson claimed that 'τὴν ἐναντίαν does not agree with τύχην, but is to be explained by the ellipse of ψῆφον.' The idiom, however, is ψῆφον θέσθαι (Middle).

936-7 a victory image of Zeus, turner of battle: cf. 867. For the technical term τροπαῖον στῆσαι, and for τροπαῖον βρέτας in place of simple τροπαῖον, see Mastronarde on *Phoen.* 572. Wiles (1997) 194 rather overinterprets the passage: 'At the end of the play Iolaus is reported to be setting up a fine statue of Zeus Tropaios ... This is suggestive of the famous monument on the battlefield [of Marathon] that took the form of a white marble Ionic column, probably topped by a statue.' In fact, Iol. and Hyllus are merely setting up the regular victory-trophy (cf. 786-7n.). It may be called an 'image of Zeus' because such trophies were often inscribed with the name of the god responsible for the victory, and their setting up was marked by ritual (cf. Xen. *Hell.* 4.3.21). Nevertheless, there was a fifth-century cult of Zeus Tropaios at the site of the battle of Marathon (cf. Parker (1996) 153) and a trophy commemorating the Athenian victory there, and these will have added to the resonance of the Held.'s victory.

938-40 they ordered me: ἐμοί carries a significant emphasis, sc. rather than bring Eury. themselves. It is a further degradation for Eury. to be manhandled by a servant. The historic present (ἐπιτέλλουσ') is more immediate (cf. Goodwin §33), stressing the result of the ordering, i.e. the Servant's arrival with the captive Eury. **to delight you ... most pleasing to see:** while it was generally accepted that one would take pleasure in punishing an enemy and would enjoy his ruin (cf. Dover (1974) 183-4), tragedy

regularly confronts the audience with disturbing revenge scenarios. Here, Alc. not only acts without the support of her male guardians, but also goes against an established Athenian law.

941-60: As Collard (134-287n.) 158 observes, the *Hcld.* resembles *Med.* and *Hec.* insofar as 'Euripides sets an agonistic scene, or formal debate, at their very end, in order to show a conflict or hatred which lasts beyond the action the whole play has resolved'. However, the formal agon pattern is slightly altered here: between Alc.'s speech of prosecution and Eury.'s defence (983-1017) comes an animated dialogue between Alc. and the Servant which already casts doubt on the legality of Alc.'s revenge (cf. 961-74n.).

941 You hateful creature: cf. 52. **at last:** cf. 869. For the traditional idea of divine justice being 'slow but sure', cf. Dodds on *Bacch.* 882-7. For the personified goddess Dike, daughter of Zeus and Themis, see West on Hes. *Theog.* 902.

943-4 dare to look your enemy in the eye: cf. 887n. **now you are ruled and rule no more:** a pithy (and gloating) expression of the absolute reversal in Eury.'s fortune.

946-7 wherever he now may be: since Alc. knows that Heracles is now a god (cf. 871-2), the euphemism (for death) is perhaps to be taken ironically (as Wilkins suggests), providing another dig at Eury.

950-2 the transposition of these lines avoids the discontinuity of ἔπεμπες (951) following κατήγαγες (949) without any connecting particle; cf. also 949n. The similar endings of 947 and 948 may have led to the scribe's confusion.

950-1 to destroy hydras and lions: i.e., the Lernaean Hydra and the Nemean lion (two of Heracles' labours: cf. 8n.); the plurals express Alc.'s indignation.

951-2 But I say nothing ... too long: Alc. cuts short a long list of Heracles' labours. Nevertheless, her way of passing over the topic (a rhetorical technique knowns as *praeteritio* or *paraleipsis*) emphasizes the extent of Heracles' suffering: cf. Usher (134-287n.) 18. Rather implausibly, Burnett (1998) 156 n. 61 sees a joke in these lines. As Lloyd (1992) notes, by abbreviating Alc.'s speech Eur. can also accommodate her dialogue with the Servant: 'This dialogue [961-74] ... make[s] up the missing part of Alcmene's speech in the structure of the scene.'

949 You even made him go down to Hades alive!: that is, to fetch Cerberus. Heracles' descent to Hades makes for an effective climax (if 950-2 are transposed) since it was thought peculiarly horrible to be sent there alive: cf. Eur. *Eurystheus* (a satyr play, c. 415-406) fr. 371N^2 (Heracles to Eurystheus) πέμπεις δ' ἐς Ἅιδου ζῶντα κοὐ τεθνηκότα ('You are sending a man to Hades who is alive, not dead!'), *Tro.* 442 (Cassandra predicts Odysseus' underworld journey). Moreover, the fetching of Cerberus is usually listed as the last of the twelve labours: cf. *Her.* 359ff., esp. 425-9.

954 from every part of Greece: cf. 31, 151, 305-6.

956 some of us old and others still young children: Alc. highlights Eury.'s cowardice and cruelty by stressing that his victims belong to two of the most vulnerable groups in Greek society.

957-8 men and a city who are free, who did not fear you: cf. 191-2, 197-8, 243-6, 284-7, 372-6.

959-60 the gain will be all yours: a very grim joke. **should be dying more than once:** for this powerful expression of hatred, cf. Dover (1974) 203.

961-74 Alc. and the Servant dispute the legality of killing Eury. In L, however (see apparatus), the dialogue is shared between the Chorus-leader and the Messenger, with Alc. interrupting dramatically at 973. L's attributions have been defended recently by Davidson (1996) 244-7 (cf. Grube (1941) 172-3, Stoessl (1956) 231-2), but the criticisms of L made by both Zuntz 125-6 and Mastronarde (1979) 96-7 remain compelling. As they point out, the demonstratives used in 964 and 968 are better suited to the Servant than to an Athenian chorus member; τοισίδ' ('these people') in 965 makes better sense if spoken to the Servant, while the third person verb used in 966 suggests a non-Athenian speaker. Moreover, the speaker of 964 and 968 knows of decisions made recently on the battlefield: it is the Servant, not the Chorus-leader, who has just returned from there.

So the changes made by Tyrwhitt (Servant for Chorus-leader) and Barnes (Alc. for Messenger) appear justified, and their signficance for the interpretation of the final scene is considerable. For now we see Alc. actively involved in a debate about the rightness of the killing *with one of her own people*. This point is missed by those who (like Murray in his old OCT) accept Barnes' change but not Tyrwhitt's, creating a dialogue between Alc. and the Chorus-leader: e.g. Conacher (1967) 119 n. 17, Burian (1977) 16 n. 44, Burnett (1998) 152 n. 47. The once common view that Alc. 'puts him [Eury.] to death over the protests of the Athenians' (Gladstone (1959) 113) is therefore mistaken. Moreover, as Collard (134-287n.) 159 points out, the objection is raised 'by one of Alcmena's own side and, not less significantly, by a servant'. The once comic Servant of Hyllus (cf. 682-739) now appears in a much more serious light, reporting the decisions of the Athenian leaders and contesting the justice of Alc.'s revenge even before Eury. makes his defence. As Lloyd (1992) 76 rightly observes, 'The dialogue between Alcmene and the Servant recalls the stichomythia between the Herald and Demophon [253-64] in the opposition of Greek law to vindictive claims purporting to be just'.

961 possible (ἀνυστόν): from ἀνύ(τ)ω ('I accomplish').

962-3 Kirchhoff detected a missing line after 962, which is then defiantly queried by Alc. in 963, and Kovacs (1996) 24 offers the supplement ἄλλως· ἀφεῖναι τοῖσιν Ἀργείοις χρεών ('To no purpose: we must release him to the Argives'); cf. 1018-19. Zuntz 126-7 supports the idea of a lacuna, referring to 'the established laws of stichomythia', but it is not impossible for the regular pattern to be broken, especially towards the start of a stichomythic series (e.g. 660-3; cf. Denniston on *El.* 651-2). Kovacs, on the other hand, argues that δὲ δή in 963 points to a change of speaker, but this too is far from certain, since 'interrogative δὲ δή is expected ... when changing the topic' (Wilkins on 963). All one can say with confidence is that interrogative δὲ δή marks a crucial question (cf. *GP* 259), often (as here) tinged with surprise. Since 962-3 can be understood together as a single utterance of Alc. (general statement followed by specific question), there is no need to mark a lacuna in the text.

963-6 But what law ...? ... Not those they take alive in battle: No specific statute existed in fifth-century Athens forbidding the execution of prisoners of war. Indeed, unless protected by the terms of a particular truce, war captives throughout the Greek world were entirely at the mercy of the winning side: cf. Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.73, Pritchett (340n.) Part 5 (1991) 205-23, D. J. Bederman, *International Law in Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2001) 255. However, we would be wrong to imagine the (largely) Athenian audience being suddenly surprised here by the invention (and mythical retrojection) of a new Athenian 'law', for *nomos* can mean 'custom' as

well as 'law', and the rarity of such executions in the fifth century suggests a widely endorsed *nomos* (in the looser sense of 'custom') advising, and praising, a certain degree of clemency towards prisoners of war (even if 'clemency' often meant being held hostage or sold into slavery): cf. P. Ducrey, *Le Traitement des prisonniers des guerre dans la Grèce antique* (Paris, 1968) 289-91 (though Ducrey is wrong to speak here of an *Athenian* servant voicing one of his city's ideals). Moreover, as G. A. Sheets, 'Conceptualizing International Law in Thucydides', *AJP* 115 (1994) 51-73, p. 70 has argued, 'International custom was not only as fully valid a source of law as written treaties, it defined the juridical order which gave meaning and effect to those treaties.' Thus, although Visser (1982) 404 overstates this customary moral reluctance when she remarks 'It was an evil thing, for the Greeks at any rate, to kill a prisoner of war once the battle was over', there was at least an expectation (however optimistic) that the more humane principle would prevail and, significantly, the *Hcld.* presents the victorious leaders of Athens supporting just such an enlightened course of action. In this context, therefore, and given that the victors were expected to abstain from 'gratuitous cruelty' (cf. Garlan (371-2n.) 54), Alc.'s conduct is deeply reprehensible, since she allows her passion for revenge to overwhelm the moral constraints of her allies and protectors. For a similar insight into the morally degenerating effects of war, cf. Thuc. 3.82.2; and for Eury.'s more general appeal to 'the laws of the Greeks', see 1009-13n.

964 **the rulers of this land:** i.e. the decision to spare Eury. stems ultimately from Dem. and Acamas themselves. Unlike the Messenger (cf. 887n.), the Servant knows of their judgement and reports it here, making the play's final scene of revenge much more complex and stimulating for the audience.

965 **these people:** i.e., the Athenians.

967-8 the Servant implies Hyllus' proper agreement with the decision of his rescuers: cf 929n. **I suppose:** the Servant's irony returns (cf. 511n.), but in a more serious and caustic manner than before.

969 Alc. throws the Servant's χρῆν αὐτόν back in his face, asserting the necessity of Eury.'s death (χρῆν τόνδε). **still see the light of day:** there are several possible solutions (see apparatus), but those of Lenting (φῶς ὁρᾶν ἔτι) and Diggle (ὁρᾶν τὸ φῶς ἔτι; for the definite article, cf. *Or.* 1523) retain ἔτι and require the smallest changes.

970 **He was first wronged... death:** Zuntz 127-8 thought this line harshly ironic and better suited to Alc., and so posited a missing line on either side of it spoken by the Servant; cf. Kovacs (1996) 24-5 for supplements of a similar kind to Zuntz. But the meaning of the line has been explained by Pearson: 'If Alcmena's view is to prevail, a double injustice will be inflicted upon Eurystheus: (1) he was deprived of his right to die on the battlefield [cf. 885-7, 1009-10], and (2) he will also lose his right to live as a captive.' For the sense of τότε, and the translation, see Diggle 492 n. 10. The Servant's riposte picks up the sense of 959-60.

971 **right:** lit. 'in [the sphere of] rightness'; cf. Cropp on *El.* 550, Kannicht on *Hel.* 1277.

973 **I am someone:** Alc. answers the Servant's prohibition in 972 with a bitterly defiant play on words ('No one ... someone'), restored by Tyrwhitt's ingenious conjecture. The use of τις in the sense 'of some importance' is colloquial: cf. Stevens (1976) 25.

975 **I love this city:** Alc. speaks like an exemplary Athenian (cf. *Eum.* 852, Thuc. 2.43.1 for a powerful image of the Athenians as lovers of their city), which makes her determination to override Athenian custom all the more disturbing.

976-7 fallen into my hands: cf. 931. **no one ... will rescue him:** cf. Burnett (1998) 154 n. 52 'Her practical indicative is in contrast to the ... theoretical optative at 972.'

978-80 Therefore (πρὸς ταῦτα)**:** lit. 'in view of these [statements]'. The phrase often comes 'after an announcement of resolve, and before a defiant imperative' (Jebb on *Ant.* 658); here the imperative is replaced by the future λέξει. **'brazen' and 'prouder than a woman should be':** cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 589-90 'an article with the predicate after "call", "name", etc. has the effect of reporting the speaker's actual words'. According to the Thucydidean Pericles, a woman's glory lies in not being talked about at all among men (Thuc. 2.45.2): cf. McClure (474-7n.) 19-24. Alc.'s imaginary speakers express the typical Greek (male) idea that women should act in public life only through their male guardians, even when seeking justice for wrongs done to themselves. Alc.'s direct action thus entails the rejection of gender constraints as well as military ethics. **brazen** (θρασεῖαν)**:** the Maiden countered the charge of θράσος (at coming into public view) by appealing to her positive concern for her family (474ff.). Here Alc. makes a very different argument (for not acting like a woman should), pointing to the necessity of revenge.

980 I shall perform (πεπράξεται + dat. agent)**:** the future perfect expresses 'certainty ... that an action will *immediately* take place' (Goodwin §79).

981-2 a terrible thing and yet understandable: significantly, it is Alc.'s quarrel, not her intention to kill Eury., which the Chorus-leader describes as 'understandable'. Nevertheless, these lines display a sympathy for Alc.'s predicament that soon develops into a more unsettling support (1021).

983-1017 the opening speech of Eury. reveals a figure quite different from the ruthless, arrogant, and cowardly tyrant we had expected: e.g. 12-13, 353-61, 743-4, 814-17. As often in Eur., a clear-cut moral view of the characters is challenged by a surprising development in their portrayal (cf., for example, the sympathetic circumstances of the deaths of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus in the *El.*). Here, there is a double surprise, as Alc. emerges as less, and Eury. as more, sympathetic than we had been led to believe. Eury. appears both composed and resigned to his fate, even acknowledging the nobility of Heracles (997-9): the audience's surprise at his portrayal is heightened by the fact that he was always depicted in art as a coward (usually hiding from Heracles in a large jar!): cf. Burnett (1998) 151 n. 42. Of course, Eury. is delivering a defence speech before an Athenian Chorus and naturally uses all the rhetorical resources at his disposal, including some dubious arguments (cf. 989-90, 1000-8nn.). Nevertheless, the contrast with Alc.'s implacable passion for revenge is to his advantage. Eury., in short, is a deeply ambivalent figure, for his death exposes the vindictive anger of Alc., yet will also benefit Athens. In this way his death provides the final, shocking surprise of the play, as the Chorus accept Alc.'s plan to kill Eury. despite the Athenian rulers' injunction against it (cf. 964, 1021, 1052, 1053-5nn.).

983-5 Eury.'s opening words are a defiant refusal to beg for his life. It is a measure of how far our sympathies are being altered in the final scene that, as Wilkins observes (on 983-1055), 'Eurystheus adopts much of the language of the earlier suppliants, while Alcmene echoes the herald. Her thoughts are bold and excessive (978-80: cf. 926-7, 386); his are of kinship (987-8) and of honour'. In particular, Eury.'s disregard for his own life (984) and his sensitivity to charges of cowardice (985) recall the sentiments of Heracles' daughter (cf. 509-10, 518-19, 533, 550-1, 562-3). But whereas the daughter of

Heracles died to save the Hcld. and Athens from Argos, Eury.'s death will protect Athens against the descendants of the Hcld. (1032-6). Thus Eury. is now surprisingly cast as the victim (albeit not so blameless a victim as Heracles' daughter), while Alc. takes over the role of relentless persecutor.

983 I shall not flatter you: for μή following the imperative ἴσθι, cf. 693-4n. θωπεύω has strong negative associations ('toady to'): cf. Pechstein (859-60n.) 261 on *Syleus* fr. 687.

987-8 kinsman to your son Heracles: Like the suppliant Iol. (207-13), Eury. appeals to ties of kinship, indeed to a similar cousin relationship (αὐτανέψιος cf. 211). Eury. and Alc. were cousins on both sides, their fathers, Sthenelus (cf. 361) and Electryon, being brothers, and their mothers, Nicippe and Eurydice, sisters (for the full family tree, see Pechstein (859-60n.) 169). Alc.'s revenge is further denigrated insofar as it also means killing kin.

989-90 for a god was responsible: Eury.'s attempt to blame Hera entirely for his actions is problematic and unconvincing, since a god's influence did not automatically remove human responsibility. In fact, Eury. was both an *instrument* of divine punishment and its responsible *agent*. Nevertheless, he does strongly suggest that his collaboration was both involuntary and repugnant ('Hera forced me to suffer this disease'; cf. 986).

992 the start of Eury.'s campaign of persecution is marked by alliteration, assonance, and *figura etymologica* (cf. 18).

993 a deviser of many sufferings: σοφιστής originally meant someone who was skilled in a particular craft (cf. Barrett on *Hipp.* 921), but a sense of implicit over-cleverness gradually developed: cf. Eur. fr. 905 μισῶ σοφιστὴν ὅστις οὐχ αὑτῷι σοφός ('I hate the clever man who isn't clever in his own interest'). Eury. had to exercise his 'skill' in devising ever more hazardous labours for Heracles. However, it is Alc. who shows true 'sophistry' in her plan for Eury.'s death (1022-5).

994 sitting through the night: lit. 'always sitting [in council] with the night'. In the *Iliad* Zeus and Agamemnon are kept awake at night making plans (2.1-4, 10.1-4); cf. *Hipp.* 375-6 (and the cheeky adaptation at *Frogs* 931, addressed to Eur.!). Here the familiar idea is enlivened by the vivid use of συνθακέω. **worked out many ways:** lit. 'gave birth to', a common metaphor for intellectual production (cf. *Suppl.* 180-1, *Her.* 767, Ar. *Frogs* 1059).

995-6 my enemies: the plural is allusive (cf. 99, Smyth §1007), referring to Heracles, but Eury.'s words also suggest the topos of the tyrant's fear of his companions (συνοικοίην); cf. A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (London, 1956) 23-6.

997-9 a surpisingly generous and dignified admission from Heracles' former tormentor. **cipher:** for ἀριθμός in the pejorative sense, 'a mere number', cf. *Tro.* 475-6. **noble things:** Diggle 56-8 records no less than fifteen conjectures, and himself suggests γ' ἔσθλ' οἷα (which I translate): haplography led to OI falling out of the sequence ΕΣΘΛΟΙΑ. Both Pearson and Kovacs prefer Headlam's γοῦν: 'he shall at all events hear good things spoken of him as befits a noble man' (Loeb). In any case, the sense is not in doubt. For the laudable gesture of acknowledging a former enemy's nobility, cf. *Aj.* 1336-45, 1355, 1381-8 (Odysseus of Ajax, his rival for Achilles' arms).

1000-8: Having explained why he became an enemy of his kinsman Heracles (989-90), Eury. now answers the imagined objection, 'But why did you continue to persecute his innocent children after his death?' Since it was generally agreed in heroic society that children should

avenge the wrongs done to their parents, it was inevitable that they too might become targets (cf. *Cypria* fr. 25 Allen, 'The man who kills the father but leaves the children is a fool'). However, when such pre-emptive strikes are defended in tragedy, it is always by less than admirable figures: *Andr.* 519-22 (Menelaus), *Hec.* 1138-44 (Polymestor), *Her.* 168-9 (Lycus), *Tro.* 723 (Odysseus). In fifth-century Athens such killings were considered brutal and unjust.

1000 was dead: lit. 'had departed [from life]', with τοῦ βίου understood; cf. 9-10, 910-11, *Hipp.* 356-7.

1002 leave no stone unturned: the saying is found in the paroemiographers (cf. Wilkins), but not elsewhere in tragedy.

1003 tried to kill them: for the conative present (participle), cf. 139-40n.

1004 If I did this (δρῶντι)**:** for the conditional participle (dative of interest after ἀσφαλῆ), cf. Goodwin §472, 841. **was likely to become:** for the dynamic imperfect, cf. ἐκαινόμην ξίφει *IT* 27 ('I [Iphigenia] was about to be put to the sword').

1005-8 Elmsley deleted L's question mark after Ἄργος in 1008, turning the phrase from a question ('Would not even (γ') you then, if you had assumed ...?') into a bitterly ironic statement. **the enemy lion's hostile offspring:** for lion cubs as fierce harbingers of revenge, cf. *Suppl.* 1222-3 (Athena predicts that the sons of the Seven will sack Thebes), *Andr.* 1169-70 (Neoptolemus, who has died at Delphi after criticizing Apollo for killing his father, is pathetically called τὸν Ἀχίλλειον / σκύμνον, 'Achilles' whelp'). βλαστήματα ('offspring') recalls 468-70 (βλαστάνοντες), where Dem. himself describes the Hcld. as potential avengers. There may also be an allusion to Heracles' heroic (and iconographic) lion-skin costume. **tolerantly** (σωφρόνως): uttered with a hiss of sarcasm. **Nobody would believe you:** lit. 'you would convince nobody [if you made such a claim]'; the protasis is inferred from the previous lines, i.e. Alc. is imagined as saying 'I would have let them live in Argos'.

1009-13 Eury. goes beyond the Servant's appeal to Athenian law (961-74) and claims protection under the religious *nomoi* of Greece. Collard (134-287n.) 159 comments 'That Eurystheus picks up the servant's moral objection, at the end of his speech, in his ambiguous appeal for a life which he admits is justly forfeit (1009ff.), is in character with his special pleading.' But while the rhetorical context is important, there is more to Eury.'s remarks than mere 'special pleading', for such religious and moral constraints would certainly possess considerable force, and a fifth-century audience would find an appeal to them significant. Of course, homicide in war did not normally incur pollution, but the execution of battlefield prisoners was thought to be different, so that Eury. can appeal to this constraint: cf. 963-6n.

1009 they did not kill me: the point of reference for the subject-less διώλεσαν is τῶνδε (1001) and βλαστήματα (1006), but really it means 'the Athenians' (964ff.).

1010 eager to die: cf. 885-7.

1011 lit. 'I am not pure/lawful for my killer if I die'.

1013 its enmity towards me: ἐμῆς is used objectively, possessive for personal pronoun (cf. δυσμενείαι σῇι *Hipp.* 965 ('through enmity towards you'), and refers to the Athenians' hatred of Eury. By contrast, Davie (Penguin) sees it referring to Alc.'s. hatred ('she [Athens] honours the gods far more than she respects your hatred of me'), but the former meaning is more natural since Eury. is concentrating here on the relationship between Athens and himself.

1014-15 You have spoken, you have heard my response: Elmsley's προσεῖπας (cf. 573) produces something very like a law-court clausula; cf. the closing words of Lys. 12: ἀκηκόατε, ἑοράκατε, πεπόνθατε, ἔχετε· δικάζετε ('You have listened, you have seen, you have suffered, you have him: judge him'). **the noble-minded one:** the sense has been much disputed, but Paley, Pearson (Appendix B, pp. 148-50), Wilkins, and Seaford (1994) 126-7 have pointed the way to the best explanation. In these lines Eury. expresses his ambiguous role vis-à-vis the Hcld. and the Athenians. For the Hcld. he will be προστρόπαιος, a murdered man who demands vengeance (cf. Aesch. *Cho.* 286, Seaford (1994) 127 n. 113), while for the Athenians he will be γενναῖος, i.e. noble in his recognition of Athens' kindness towards him. There is therefore no need to label τόν τε γενναῖον corrupt (as Diggle does: see Wilkins), since Eury. will indeed be noble-minded or 'gracious' (Pearson) insofar as he frees the Athenians from the pollution of his death (cf. 1011) and rewards them for their restraint (cf. 1012, 1026-36). Kovacs (1996) 25-7, however, finds the text unacceptable, since (he argues) the lines are addressed exclusively to Alc. and Eury. cannot demand that Alc. call him γενναῖος. But Eury.'s remarks are meant for both the Hcld. (including Alc.) and the Athenians, and in them Eury. contrasts how he will be seen by each group in the future. The definite articles have the effect of quoting the speakers' words: cf. 978-80n. Kovacs posits a lacuna within 1015 and supplements it thus (adopting F. W. Schmidt's τόνδε for τόν τε): ἐντεῦθεν δὲ χρὴ / τὸν προστρόπαιον τόνδε <δυσσεβῶς θανεῖν / ἢ σ' ἐκ φόνου σωθέντα> γενναῖον καλεῖν ('henceforth I, who am under a god's protection, must either < be impiously put to death, or if I am delivered from slaughter,> must call <you> noble' (Loeb)). But as J. Gibert (169-70n.) points out, this solution means that 'Eurystheus will in effect say "Thank you" if he is spared by Alcmene. This ill suits his attitude of defiance (especially 983-5) and makes him appear to imagine mercy as a real possibility, as nothing else in the speech does.' So there is no need to posit such a lacuna; 1014-15 make sense as they stand, though they are highly compressed: there is antithesis with asyndeton in the first half of 1014, and an even bolder contrast in 1015. However, Kovacs is perhaps right to accept Schmidt's τόνδε, for as Seaford (1994) 127 points out, with this 'slight change ... the sentence is a dramatic and elegant expression of the essential paradox of hero-cult: "henceforth it is necessary to call this (τόνδε) angry victim (προστρόπαιον) - i.e. me - noble." Resigned to his imminent death, Eurystheus claims the simultaneous power of the hero to harm (the descendants of his killer Alkmene) and to benefit (Athens).' Cf. 1030-6n.

1016-17 Eury.'s speech comes full circle as he once again stresses his indifference to Alc.'s threats of death: cf. his opening words (983-5). **me** (τἄμ): for the neut. art. and possessive pronoun as an idiom for 'me', cf. 1004.

1018-25 Murray thought there was a lacuna before these lines in which a messenger arrived with a further decree that Alc. let Eury. go (cf. ἐπεὶ δοκεῖ πόλει 1019). But as Pearson points out, the Chorus-leader's ἀφεῖναι 'does not introduce a new idea. The only alternatives considered as possible are either to kill the captive or *to let him go*, that is, *to spare his life* [my italics].' Cf. Eury.'s ἀφῆκε at 1012 and 1027, where the sense is '[Athens] spared me'. Nevertheless, Alc. cunningly plays on the ambiguity of the word, interpreting the city's decision as if it were 'to release this man - *alive or dead* (cf. 1020-5, esp. 1024). Yet her ingenuity cannot disguise the fundamental illegality and vindictiveness of her proposal.

1020 Alc.'s question comes as a shock since the the combination of Eury.'s death with her obedience to the city seems impossible. Indeed the Chorus-leader has just reminded Alc. of the city's decision that Eury. should not be killed (1019; cf. 964).

1021 That would be best: The Chorus-leader's reply is even more disturbing than Alc.'s question, for he immediately accepts her assurance that she will be obeying the city (1020), despite the fact that the city's *nomos* clearly forbids killing the prisoner. Respect for *nomoi* was a central principle of Athenian democracy (cf. e.g. *Suppl.* 433-7, Thuc. 2.37.3, Lys. 2.18-19), so the Chorus' readiness here to abandon the stated *nomos* of Athens is very unsettling, especially in the light of their scrupulous conduct in the past (cf. 271-3). The audience see an Athenian Chorus comply with a vengeful murder, and Eur. uses their surprise to highlight the contrast between the optimistic ideals of Athenian justice and the harsher facts of political reality. [Even if one translates the line as 'May it be for the best. So what is to happen here?', the Chorus-leader does not object to Eury.'s murder.]

1023 to those of his friends who come for him: Wilkins (influenced perhaps by 1024) glosses this as 'the Athenians rather than the sons of Eurystheus', but Alc. can hardly describe the Athenians as Eury.'s *philoi*. Eury. is yet to announce his heroic grave in Attica (1030-6), and so Alc. naturally envisages his corpse being reclaimed for burial by his Argive kin. Battlefield prisoners were normally ransomed to their relatives or sold into slavery and were thus worth more alive than dead, but Alc. wants Eury. dead at any cost.

1024-5 as regards his body: 'Alcmene plays ambiguously on the senses of σῶμα as both "living body" and "dead body"' (Wilkins). **I will not be disobeying the city:** Alc. recalls 968 (τῆιδ' ἀπιστήσαι χθονί ~ οὐκ ἀπιστήσω χθονί), but the Servant's argument there undermines Alc.'s current sophistry. Alc. acts as if all that mattered to the city was the release of Eury., alive or dead. **pay the penalty to me:** despite her talk of obeying the city, Alc. is interested only in her private revenge (cf. 965, 976-80).

1026-44 Eury.'s final speech further unsettles the initially clear-cut moral division between himself and the Hcld. He reveals an oracle of Apollo that says he is to be buried in Attica, where his grave will protect Athens from invasion by the Hcld.'s descendants. This prophecy reverses the alliances and enmities at work in the play so far, complicating the sympathies and moral response of the (Athenian) audience. Even in death Eury. remains hostile to the Hcld., whereas the Athenians gain him as a protector. Yet although he describes his prophecy as a gift to Athens for sparing his life (1028), it is far from being purely altruistic, for it also punishes his killers (cf. 1044). Eury. overlooks the fact that the Chorus-leader agreed to his death (1021), stressing instead the city's decision to spare him (1026-7). But while the city's stance is vindicated and rewarded, the sight of an Athenian Chorus giving way to revenge remains disturbing. Burnett (1998) 153 argues that 'As before [i.e. with the daughter of Heracles], the appearance of a willing victim [Eury.] saves the Athenians from abandoning an action that they know is right.' However, the two actions (protecting the Hcld. and killing the captive Eury.) are very different, and Eury.'s 'willingness' (cf. 1016-17) does not remove all the questions about his death.

1026-7 Kill on: 'The present [imperative] denotes that her purpose is already formed' (Pearson); cf. *Hec.* 1281. **I do not ask you for mercy:** Alc.'s implacable desire for revenge is matched by Eury.'s continued defiance (cf. 983-5). **forbore to kill me**

(κατηιδέσθη): i.e. unlike Alc., whose lack of *aidôs* recalls the Herald: cf. 101-4, 127-9, 961-74nn.

1028-9 an ancient oracle of Loxias: the oracle's age underlines its authority (cf. *Eum.* 778). Eury.'s revelation of a divine prophecy serves several functions normally performed by a *deus ex machina*; in Eury.'s case these are well summed up by F. M. Dunn (*Tragedy's End: Closure and Innovation in Euripidean Drama* (Oxford, 1996) 41) as 'foretelling the future, offering an aetiology, and using his special authority to effect a resolution'. In the *Hec.* (1259-81) Polymestor reveals a prophecy of Dionysus that harms his enemies, Hecuba and Agamemnon (compare *Cycl.* 696-700, where Polyphemus recalls an oracle that predicts Odysseus' future sufferings), but Eury. is not so thoroughly unsympathetic as Polymestor, not least because his prophecy turns him into a saviour of Athens. The truth of Eury.'s remarkable heroization is guaranteed by the divine authority of an oracle (contrast the semi-divine Medea, who can predict her own and her family's future by herself: *Med.* 1378-88). The common poetic name Loxias probably derives from the root λοξός, meaning 'oblique' or 'ambiguous'. Apollo's oracles could be notoriously cryptic, but Eury. has received one of startling clarity.

1030-6 Eury. predicts (or perhaps commands: cf. 1030n.) his burial at Pallene, where his tomb will protect Athens in war and he will be honoured as a hero (cf. 1040-1n.). Hero-cults are an unusual and distinctive feature of Greek religion: cf. Burkert (1985) 203-8. They are detectable throughout Greece from the late eighth century onwards and honour a wide variety of figures (for the numerous Attic heroes, see Parker (1996) 33-9), the most common being a community's saviour in battle (cf. e.g. the cult of Erechtheus on the Acropolis in Athens; *Il.* 2.546-51). Heroes usually assist their own communities, but in the case of Orestes and Oedipus, for example, the heroes protect their benefactors (the Athenians) against their own people (the Argives and Thebans respectively) from their tomb; cf. *Eum.* 767-71, *OC* 576-628. However, Eury. is not simply a foreign protector like Orestes and Oedipus, for he also belongs to the (at first sight puzzling: cf. 1029) category of 'enemy hero'; that is, he defends after death the very community which he once tried to destroy; cf. e.g. *Sept.* 587-9 and Hdt. 8.134 on the heroized seer Amphiaraus, and see in general Visser (1982). According to Herodotus (5.113-15), the people of Amathus were told by an oracle to worship their dead enemy Onesilus as a hero, and Plutarch relates that the people of Citium on Cyprus heroized Cimon who had died besieging their town (*Cim.* 19.5). In Athens the dreaded Amazons (cf. 217n.) were also, like Eury., recipients of cult after their defeat (cf. Paus. 1.2.1). In the case of Eury.'s death and heroization, Seaford (1994) 126 sees a strong contrast between the blameless Athenians and the 'vindictive outsider' Alcmene. However, while it is true that Athens behaves justly towards the prisoner and is not responsible for his death, the conduct of the Chorus ensures that the play does not end on a purely triumphalist note: cf. 1021, 1026-44, 1053-5nn.

1030-1 Eury., like Oedipus, defends Athens from a tomb inside Attica itself. Later sources attest a tomb of Eury. near the Scironian rocks (cf. 859-60n., Paus. 1.44.10, Apollod. 2.8.1), but Eur.'s version points to a tomb and hero-cult of Eury. in the heart of Attica (for the central position of Pallene, see 849-50n.). Some scholars have argued that Eur. invents the hero-cult here, but an aetiology of a purely imaginary cult would be entirely out of keeping with Eur.'s normal practice at the end of his plays: see 1040-1n. As Webster (1967) 105 puts it, 'The end is clearly determined by the known position of

Eurystheus' grave.' In contrast to Athens' other protector, Heracles' daughter (cf. Intro. §1(f), 588-9n.), Eury.'s cult is made explicit, not least because it will defend Athens from future attacks. Like the Marathonian Tetrapolis (32n.), the League of Athena Pallenis (comprising the demes Pallene, Gargettus, Paeania, and Acharnae) was a cult organization dating from archaic times (cf. Parker (1996) 330-1; R. Schlaifer, 'The Cult of Athena Pallenis', *HSCP* 54 (1943) 35-67). Significantly, there is evidence that Athens' policy towards the cult-places of Attica became much more active both before and during the Peloponnesian War. Krummen (1993) 216 argues that the Athenian' increased concern for building or renewing cults and sanctuaries 'might be interpreted as a means of controlling the country, but also as a sort of religious fortification, meant to ensure both the protection of the gods and heroes, and on the other hand, to keep the enemy off.' This idea ties in well with the fact that the Treasury of Athena Pallenis was transferred to Athens in 434. As Schlaifer observes (p. 51), 'From these funds the goddess lent money to the state [i.e. to help fund the war].' Thus the cult of Athena Pallenis will have been considered important to Athens' future at the time of the play's performance, and given the content of Eury.'s prophecy (for the Hcld.'s *Spartan* descendants, see 1034-6n.), a renewal of Eury.'s cult itself in the late 430s seems very likely.

1030 you will bury (θάψεθ'): in support of Dobree's θάψαθ' Wilkins quotes several parallels for 'the imperative instructing burial at the end of the play'. He goes on, 'γὰρ will then introduce a paratactic condition: bury me where it is fated ..., and I will treat you kindly.' **where it is fated:** the articular τὸ μόρσιμον ('destiny'; cf. *Sept.* 263) rather than the adjective (μόρσιμον) underlines the fact that the oracle's terms are 'fate(d)'.

1032-3 I shall lie forever beneath the earth: by stressing his constant presence in Attica, Eury. reminds the audience (at a timely moment: cf. 'in time' 1029; 1030-1, 1034-6nn.) of the importance of maintaining his cult. **a foreign resident** (μέτοικος): the word, referring to free non-citizen residents of Athens, occasionally has a strong political tone in tragedy (cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 609, 994, *Eum.* 1011, 1018); here it underlines the fact that Eury., an *outsider*, is to dwell in Attica *permanently*; cf. Kearns (Intro. n. 40) 334 'Eurystheus, in a play full of surprises, promises unlikely help, from a source not entirely outside the city, but not fully within it either.' As Edith Hall points out (on *Pers.* 319), 'The tragedians often used the idea [of *metoikia*] metaphorically, especially in pathetic reference to men buried away from home.' Here, however, the word is used by Eury. not so much to arouse pathos at his death as to stress his new (religious more than political) status in Athens. Eury.'s positive transformation from invader to hero is counter-balanced by the prediction of Heraclid animosity towards Athens: see next note.

1034-6 the descendants of these children: for reference to ἔκγονοι in other *deus*-speeches, cf. *Andr.* 1247-9, *Suppl.* 1213-26, *Ion* 1581-94. Descendants of the Hcld. conquered the Peloponnese and divided it into three parts: Messenia, Argos, and Sparta. The most powerful of these states, and the most hostile to Athens, was Sparta, whose two royal houses, the Agiads and the Eurypontids, claimed descent from the Hcld. via the twin sons of Aristodemus, Eurysthenes and Procles (cf. Hdt. 6.52). Zuntz 84-7 argues from this passage for a performance date in the spring of 430, and although this is an attractive suggestion, it is not entirely certain: see Intro. §7. Nonetheless, we can at least be sure that in a play performed sometime in the late 430s Eury.'s promise to protect Athens against invasion from the Peloponnese will have been seen as a reference to

attacks from the Spartans and their allies (cf. 278-9n.). Whether the audience interpreted this as referring to an invasion that had yet to take place, or to renewed attacks in the next campaigning season, would depend on the precise year of the performance (which remains uncertain), but in either case the sudden foregrounding of the connection between the Hcld. and the Spartans is, given the major alliances of the play, deeply shocking. (Insofar as the Argive Eury. is here seen as favouring Athens, it is interesting that Argos was not an enemy of Athens *c.* 430 and was bound by a treaty not to attack Sparta (its traditional enemy) until 421; cf. Thuc. 5.14) **when they betray this favour** (χάριν) **of yours:** in the opening scenes of the play the ties of *charis* between the Hcld. and Athens are repeatedly stressed, culminating in Athens' protection of the suppliants (cf. 214-22, 236, 333-4, 438nn.). Now, however, Eury. foretells the betrayal of Athens' support, and thereby harms his own enemies, the Hcld. Significantly, Eury.'s prediction could also be interpreted by an Athenian audience *c.* 430 as a criticism of contemporary Spartan ingratitude: the Spartans have gone to war against Athens despite the city's crucial role in saving their ancestors. In the early fourth century the Athenian orator Isocrates uses a similar argument to suggest that Sparta should submit to Athenian hegemony: he equates Sparta with the Hcld. and stresses the debt they owe to Athens for protecting the defenceless suppliants (4.54-63).

1036-7 Such are the guests you have defended: the close relationship between Athens and the Hcld. (cf. 584-6n.) is disurbingly denied. As Dunn (1028-9n.) 72 observes, Eury.'s prophecy 'offers comforting proof that Athenian virtue shall be rewarded, but only by reversing the expected means to this end: the friends of Athens will become enemies and her enemies will become friends. In this historical and political frame, the action is both more intelligible and more uncertain.' More positively, Seaford (1994) 135 detects an implicit contrast between 'the instability of (friendly or hostile) reciprocity and the permanence of cult that unites the polis over generations'. Here Athens' 'traditional' role as defender of the weak leads to unwelcome consequences for the city; one might compare Medea's successful supplication of Aegeus, which eventually leads to the child-killer's presence in Athens (cf. *Med.* 709-30, 846-55, 1384-5).

1037-40 Eury. tries to answer an obvious source of puzzlement: Why did he invade Attica, if he already knew of an oracle implicitly predicting his death and burial there (1027-31)? His answer betrays not only a misunderstanding of Hera's purpose (which was to persecute Heracles, not to save him), but also a foolish disregard for oracles (which are invariably vindicated in tragedy). He assumed that Hera would go to any lengths, even destroying Athens, in order to protect him and her favourite city Argos, but cf. *Il.* 4.51-4, where Hera offers Zeus free reign to sack her three favourite cities (Argos, Sparta, and Mycenae) in return for granting her wish. As Parker (352n.) 150 comments, the gods of tragedy are never angry with Athens: 'Here tragic and civic theology converge.'

1039-40 Hera was far stronger: a brachylogy: καὶ ... προδοῦναι presupposes a preceding infinitive, namely εἶναι with κρείσσω.

1040-1 But do not allow allow libations or blood to drip on my tomb: Pearson remarks 'It is not usual or necessary to express the subject to the infinitive [i.e. στάξαι] ... But αὐτοῖς in 1042 shows that the speaker has the Heraclidae in mind.' However, this is far from being obvious. If Eury. had meant the ban to apply only to the Hcld. (who were last mentioned at 1036), he would have said so more explicitly. In fact, the natural way to read the sentence is to take 'libations' and 'blood' as separate subjects of the infinitive;

that is, to understand the lines as a general prohibition of all libations and sacrifices at Eury.'s tomb. Yet if such offerings were standard practice at hero-cults (cf. Burkert (1985) 205), why does Eury. forbid them at his own? Although the efficacy of hero-cult is often predicated on the fulfilment of particular conditions, such as the performace of certain kinds of sacrifice (cf. *Erechth.* fr. 370. 77-86 K), a general ban on offerings is highly unusual. Nonetheless, its purpose here is understandable from the context: 'The spirit of the murdered man is to remain unappeased, until he has signalised his vengeance by the disasters of his enemies' (Pearson); cf. Burnett (1998) 156 n. 57 'the anger of the dead, thus unappeased, will offer a daemonic barrier to invasion'. Seaford (1994) 128 well explains the larger structure of the argument: 'The exclusion is universal, but affects in particular the descendants of Herakles, *for* it is with them that the hero is angry (hence the γάρ in 1042: "*for* I will give them a bad homecoming ...").' Kovacs (1996) 21-3 finds the idea of Eury. being kept 'on a fast' unacceptable and therefore proposes that we understand ἐάσητ' as 'omit' rather than 'permit' (i.e. Eury. instructs the Athenians *not to omit* the pouring of libations, etc.), but as Kovacs himself says, this would be a rare usage of the verb, and his translation seems forced.

Some scholars resort to the unlikely idea (mentioned by Kearns (1989) 49 and endorsed by Dunn (1028-9n.) 56) that Eury. is to receive no libations or sacrifice because Eur. 'would seem to be explaining to his audience why his "aetiology" has no correlative in actual cult-practice' (Kearns). But as Kearns points out herself, Eur. has carefully placed Eury.'s cult next to a temple, and later sources mention his burial there. Further, Pallene was a place of great national interest (cf. 1030-1n.) and the site of a famous shrine, and Eur. is unlikely to have created a cult there out of nothing. Fictional and negative aetiologies are found elsewhere in Greek literature (e.g. *Od.* 13.125-87, which explain why mortals are no longer helped by the Phaeacians), and one might also argue that Eury.'s grave is best made 'invisible' so that Athens' enemies can never control or appease it (cf. *Erechth.* fr. 370. 87-9 K, *OC* 1522-35). But hero-cults were taken very seriously by the Greeks and one could not simply invent them willy-nilly. (Compare the public burial of the bones of the fallen Athenian soldiers in 431/0: Thuc. 2.34. They too were honoured with heroic cult.) Most importantly, it would be quite contrary to Euripidean practice for the *Hcld.* to end with the aetiology of an *invented* cult, for Eur. uses aetiologies to illustrate (and to reflect upon) the *continuity* between events of the heroic age and the contemporary world of the audience; for cults founded elsewhere in Attica, cf. *IT* 1462-7 (Athena predicts the cult of Iphigenia at Brauron), *Suppl.* 934-9 (Theseus orders the building of Capaneus' tomb at Eleusis); also *Eum.* 890-1, *OC* 1526-34, *Hipp.* 29-33, *Suppl.* 1196-1212, *Her.* 1328-35, *Phoen.* 1703-7. The prohibition of libations and sacrifice may be an unusual request, but it was presumably a characteristic and familiar feature of Eury.'s cult, and it is better explained as 'a means of sustaining the anger of the hero' (Seaford (1994) 128) than as a reason for the cult's non-existence! In other words, Eury.'s specific instructions point to a particular type of hero worship, not to the fictionality of the cult itself. Moreover, as Wilkins points out, the ban on libations and blood 'does not preclude other forms of worship'. The Athenians could therefore perpetuate Eury.'s cult (and perhaps cultivate it all the more assiduously in the late 430s: 1030-1n.) without breaking the terms of Eury.'s request.

1042 In return for this: i.e., in return for the city's sparing him and honouring his cult. **a disastrous return here:** unlike 310 and 587, νόστος does not here refer to the Hcld.'s

'homecoming' to the Peloponnese (over which the defeated Eury. has no control), but rather to their descendants' hostile return to Attica (1035); cf. *Suppl.* 1194-5, 1208-9.

1043-4 I will benefit you and damage them: Eury. ends his address to the Athenians (which began at 1030) by summing up the double blessing of his death: the city will be protected and its future enemies destroyed. But from his own perspective this also means the punishment of his killers.

1045-9 Alc. is so determined to have her revenge that she overlooks the promise of defeat for her descendants, should Eury. be killed (1034-6, 1044). The punishment of her enemy is now all that matters to her (cf. *Hec.* 1274), and her rage renders her insensitive to the consequences of her action (cf. Medea, who accepts the death of her children as a price worth paying for Jason's ruin: *Med.* 1361-2, 1398). **Why ... do you delay to kill this man?:** Alc. speaks as if the benefits were such as to justify the Athenians killing Eury. immediately themselves, but the deed is truly her responsibility: cf. 1050-1. **it is fated:** χρεών (sc. ἐστι) = χρή. **the man is an enemy, and his death brings benefit:** whereas Eury. appealled to Athenian self-interest to support his posthumous hero-cult (1042-4), Alc. exploits the idea of Eury.'s death being a blessing for Athens in order to seal her own revenge.

1050-1 Take him away, servants, then you must kill him: The servants (played by silent extras) have been guarding the captive Eury. throughout the scene, having escorted him on to the stage at 928 (they are presumably servants of Hyllus who were present at the battle). Alc. orders Eury.'s execution off-stage (as is usual for violent deaths in tragedy). Exactly where Eury. is killed is not significant and so is left unspecified, though we know that his body will eventually be buried at Pallene. **and give him to the dogs:** by contrast, the new detail of Eury.'s mutilation by dogs is both important and surprising. However, many scholars question whether Alc. can have issued such an order, and try to emend the text (removing the dogs: see below) either because they think it conflicts with Alc.'s plan at 1022-4, where she says she will hand over Eury.'s corpse to the Argives, or because it implies a denial of burial.

Let us deal with these two objections in turn: first, the claim that Alc.'s command contradicts her earlier offer to return Eury.'s body to his *philoi* (1022-4). In fact, there is no real inconsistency here: Alc.'s earlier suggestion was a sophistic ploy to reassure the Chorus that killing the captive Eury. would not involve disobeying the city's will. However, after Eury.'s prophecy Alc. knows that Eury. will never be handed over to his kin, but buried (as a future hero) in Attica, and so she decides to commit one final outrage against him by throwing his body to the dogs. (As Paley expresses her motivation (on 1050), 'The fact is, Alcmena is still further exasperated by his threats against the descendants of Hercules.') Scavenging corpse-eating dogs are familiar from the *Iliad*, where they await the bodies of those warriors unlucky enough not to be rescued by their comrades or released for ransom: cf. C. Segal, *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the Iliad* (Leiden, 1971) Index *s.v.* κύων. To be thrown to the dogs represented a terrible fate, for such treatment brought not only mutilation but also dishonour, which is exactly why Alc. uses such an extreme form of violence and abuse against her dead enemy. Thus we should not assume, as Grube (1941) 173 does, that this is a mere curse on Alc.'s part.

The second objection made to Eury.'s mutilation by dogs is that it comes 'with implicit refusal of burial or funeral ritual' (Wilkins on 1050-1), cf. Kovacs (1996) 18-19.

Admittedly, the expression 'throw the body to the dogs' often implies that the body will not (or should not) be buried, for the dead man's family or comrades may not be able to recover the body or they may have been forbidden to do so (cf. *Ant.*), but the situation here is very different. For Alc. to deny Eury. burial would certainly be a way of inflicting further vengeance and humiliation on him, but after Eury.'s prophecy and Alc.'s acknowledgement of it (1045-9), refusal of burial is clearly not an option (nor would it be within Alc.'s power). Scholars have mistakenly equated the flesh-eating dogs with an automatic denial of burial, when in fact there is no contradiction in seeing Eury.'s body mangled and then retrieved for his tomb. Indeed, the bones were all that had to be interred in a grave to give it significant ritual power, as the stories of Orestes', Melanippus', and Theseus' bones make clear (Hdt. 1.68, 5.67, Plut. *Thes.* 36). In each case, a state or tyrant (Sparta, Cleisthenes of Sicyon, and Athens respectively) disinters the hero's skeleton and reburies it on their own land for political and military advantage. Returning to the present context, however, one must confess that dogs do not leave tidy piles of bones to be collected and there is a strong impression that a *body was buried.* But, I would argue, it is entirely possible to imagine Eury.'s body being torn and disfigured before being recovered for burial by the Athenians.

Alc. may now be aware of Eury.'s future Attic cult, but as his passionate enemy she naturally does nothing to further it, since this is the task of those it will benefit: as Burnett (1976) 25 n. 38 points out, 'Her servants are to kill but not to bury; the state [i.e. Athens] will bury the body according to the oracle.' Thus Alc.'s command does not necessarily imply lack of burial, nor should it be construed as a mere threat which was then countermanded in some putative missing lines: see 1052n. In fifth-century Athens those guilty of treason or sacrilege were generally denied burial within the city's borders, but Eury.'s status is different, since he is an enemy invader whose burial will turn him into a benefactor of Athens. Therefore, unable to deny Eury. burial, Alc. does all she can to punish her dead enemy and his family. Moreover, evidence suggests that by the fifth century mutilation of the dead, even of the enemy dead, was considered brutally excessive and was banned (cf. V. J. Rosivach, 'On Creon, Antigone, and Not Burying the Dead', *RhM* 126 (1983) 193-211, esp. 200-1, who discusses *Ant.* and *Eur. El.* 895-906 in particular). The flouting of such a widely shared moral constraint would reinforce the vengeful and unsympathetic characterization of Alc.

So neither of the main objections brought against the dogs is convincing and they should be allowed to stay and do their mutilating work. Kovacs (1996) 20-1 lists the various suggestions made instead of κυσίν (1050): πυρί (Elmsley), τάφωι (M. Haupt), κόνει (Housman), πόλει (Willink), but he has to admit that 'The lack of any explanation for the intrusion of κυσίν into the text has deprived these otherwise good suggestions of full persuasiveness.' Although he goes on to claim that this 'in no way vitiates the strong case against κυσίν', our discussion has shown that the case against the dogs is in fact dubious. Kovacs himself suggests the small change to χύσιν ('libation'), but this is contrary to the terms of Eury.'s future cult (cf. 1040-1n.), and it seems unlikely that Eury.'s killers would be asked to offer libations to him (and if they did, is δοῦναι the right word? Something like ἐκχέω seems more apt: cf. *Cho.* 97); also, as David Bain (*CR* 47 (1997) 19) points out in his review of Kovacs' Loeb edition, 'The Willink-Kovacs text suggested in the apparatus [i.e. ἔνθα χρὴ χύσιν / δοῦναι θανόντι] is not rhetorically apt. The stress should be on the *killing* of Eurystheus and

the disposal of his body, not on pouring out libations after he is dead (N.B. what follows, μὴ γὰρ ἐλπίσηις...).'

Alc.'s cruelty is reflected in the later mythological tradition. According to Apollodorus 2.8.1, Hyllus killed Eury. and sent his head to Alc., who gouged out its eyes with weaving pins. (For beheading as a mark of revenge, cf. Edwards on *Il.* 17.38-40, 18.176-7.) Seaford (1994) 129 n. 119 even suggests that Eur. may have made Alc. responsible for the beheading in the lacuna after 1052: 'perhaps she decapitated Eurystheus, for there is a tradition that his head was buried separately from his body (Strabo 8.6.19, whose location for the body coincides with Euripides').' Strabo, who says that Eury.'s body was buried at Gargettus (next to Pallene) and his head at Tricorynthus (*c.* 8kms north east of Marathon), actually ascribes the beheading to Iol. The only reference to Eury.'s beheading before Eur.'s play also makes Iol. responsible (Pind. *Pyth.* 9.80). Eur. may well have adapted this myth and had Eury. decapitated by Alc., but one must first accept that there is a lacuna after 1052 where this was announced (see next note). Dealing with the text as it stands, however, the oracle of Apollo simply says that Eury. will be buried at Pallene; there is no mention of Tricorynthus. We do not know whether Eury. was already connected to Tricorynthus in the 430s or was put there later. All we can say with any confidence is that if Eur. did know of the head's separate burial there, he chose not to mention it, perhaps because it would involve dishonouring Eury. and splitting his protective powers against the Spartans (Tricorynthus is much further from Athens than Pallene and less important both religiously and strategically).

1052 Many scholars have seen Alc.'s command to give Eury. to the dogs as proof of a lacuna after line 1052. McLean (1934) 219 posits an entire missing scene in which 'such animal ferocity is outlawed', but the play is far from being so optimistic: cf. 1053-5n. And it is often thought that in the supposed gap in our text someone (perhaps the Chorus itself) protested against Alc.'s threat to deny Eury. burial (cf. e.g. Pearson xxxvii, Burian (1977) 19 n. 49, Lesky (1977) 238, Wilkins xxx-xxxi, Seaford (1994) 128-9, Davidson (1996) 246 n. 14). The *communis opinio* is well represented by Wilkins (on 1052): 'A lacuna after this line is certain ... It is unbelievable that the chorus should acquiesce so readily in the death, let alone the non-burial of a prospective hero'. However, as we have seen (1050-1n.), Alc.'s words do not actually entail the non-burial of Eury.'s corpse, but rather its mutilation and dishonour. Burnett (1998) 156 n. 56 is therefore right to criticize Wilkins' complaint about the extant text: 'As to acquiescing in "non-burial", this the chorus plainly does not do; the spectators know that Apollo and the city will see to it that the remains go into the fated tomb.' Moreover, as regards Wilkins' first point, that the Chorus acquiesce in Eury.'s death, this is certainly true, but it is far from 'unbelievable'. In fact, as I shall argue, it is not only believable but also essential to the shocking impact of the play's final scene: see 1053-5n.

The fact that a lacuna is unnecessary emerges from a brief consideration of various proposals as to its content. The theory of choral intervention criticized above derives from Murray's comment in his old OCT edition: 'videtur post rixam unum Hemichorium Alcmenae scelus detestatum abire velle: alterum ταὐτὰ δοκεῖ μοι dicere' ('It seems that after the break one half of the Chorus wanted nothing to do with Alcmene's abominable crime; the other half said 'This seems right to me'). As we saw, however, there is no need for (part of) the Chorus to object to Alc.'s command or to add a proviso that Eury.'s

burial go ahead. S. Goldhill, 'Civic Ideology and the Problem of Difference', *JHS* 120 (2000) 34-56, p. 55 with n. 87 thinks there was 'probably' a report of Eury.'s death; he does not say where the report came or who made it, but does agree with Wilkins that there is a lacuna after 1052. Wilkins (on 1052, cf. xvii n. 19) himself suggests that in the missing lines Alc. may have made further arrangements for Eury.'s death, but he does not specify what these might be. Is anything else needed? After all, Eury. has already prophesied the place and circumstances of his burial, and Alc. has ordered her servants to kill him. If Eur. had wanted to connect Eury. to Tricorynthus, Alc. is not the figure to do it, and so one would have to argue that some other speaker had dropped out. The same applies to Wilkins' other suggestion (1052; xix) that the daughter of Heracles may have been named Macaria and connected to the spring of that name at Tricorynthus. This is the the kind of aetiological speech normally performed by gods, so are we to imagine that Heracles or Athena (for example) appeared to make these links clear? Such an intervention is possible, of course, but we have already had Eury.'s *deus*-like speech and an *aition* of his cult (cf. 1028-9n.). Most importantly, if we can make sense of the text as it stands, we should refrain from positing such major additions (cf. 1053-5n.). Moreover, there are good dramatic reasons for the absence of any reference to Macaria's cult and Eury.'s presence at Tricorynthus: cf. Intro. §1(f), 1050-1n. It is part of the play's final reversal of audience sympathy that the consolation of hero-cult be given not to Athens' saviour, the daughter of Heracles, but to Eury., its former enemy.

Incidentally, Kovacs (1996) 19 n. 1 has questioned the common assumption (included in Diggle's apparatus) that Hermann first proposed a lacuna after 1052. In any case, Hermann seems to have thought that a report of Macaria's death (followed by lamentation) had been lost from the end of the play (an idea we have reason to reject); he makes no reference to any missing objections to Alc.'s plans by the Chorus.

1053-5 This seems right to me: Wilkins (on 1052) has dismissed as 'incredible' the idea that the Chorus could accept Alc.'s arrangements in such a 'bland' fashion. Their reaction would indeed be unbelievable if they were agreeing to Eury.'s non-burial, as Wilkins supposes, but this is not what they are doing (cf. 1050-1n.). What they approve of is Alc.'s undertaking of responsibility for Eury.'s death, and it is not 'incredible', though it may be disturbing in other respects, that they are, as Kovacs (1996) 20 puts it, 'willing to allow a death which (a) is fated, (b) brings them great benefit and their enemies great harm, and (c) does not involve them personally in pollution.' The truly shocking aspect of their behaviour is that by agreeing to Alc.'s plan, they are effectively disobeying the *nomos* of Athens and the stated decision of its rulers (cf. 961-6, 1018-19). Thus the final scene distinguishes between the city and the Chorus, and this important point has been overlooked by those who deny that the play's ending could be anything but wholly cheering and pro-Athenian. Wilkins (1990b) 189, for example, remarks 'I do not resist "ironic" interpretations of other plays, such as those of *Phoenissae* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*', but he does resist 'irony' in the *Hcld.*, explaining that 'In *Heraclidae* itself there is, to be sure, the adverse force of Alcmene and the Spartans. Do these prevail in the end, ironically? If we accept the final lines of the play as they stand, perhaps Athens does appear to acquiesce in a barbarous act. But such an interpretation demands a radical reversal in the presentation of Athens, more abrupt and curtly treated than anywhere else in Euripides. I do not believe that Athens is undermined in *Heraclidae* or in *Erechtheus* (as far as we can tell about that play).' However, while I would agree that

Athens itself is not undermined in the *Hcld.*, I would argue that there is still an 'ironic' or critical aspect to the play's final movement (see below), which is effected through the independent action of the Chorus. **On your way, servants:** the servants (ὀπαδοί) addressed here are the ones addressed by Alc. in 1050 (δμῶες): cf. Zuntz (1947) 50. **For our actions will be free from pollution to our rulers.** the final words of the Chorus express both their independent approval of Alc.'s conduct ('our actions') and their sensitivity to the reaction of their leaders. At 1018-19 they still advised Alc. to spare Eury. 'since the city deems it right'. However, after Eury.'s prophecy of his posthumous benefits to Athens, and after Alc.'s reassurances, they are now willing to go along with her plan, on the grounds that Eury.'s death will not harm their rulers. They reassure themselves that since Eury.'s murder is to be Alc.'s responsibilty, she alone will incur the pollution attendant on homicide. Nevertheless, there is a disturbing side to their decision, for while they act in the state's best interests, they do so at the expense of an established Attic *nomos*. They are clearly swayed by Alc.'s willingness to kill as well as by Eury.'s prophecy of a protective hero-cult, but does this give them the right to act as they do? If they know that both Attic law and the rulers of Athens forbid the killing of Eury., why do they agree to his *immediate* execution by Alc.?

It would be a mistake to think that because the play continues to present the city of Athens and its rulers in a favourable light, it cannot at the same time raise challenging questions about revenge, self-interest, and the mutability of human relationships. The city and its rulers are certainly rewarded for their just conduct with the institution of a protective cult, but the circumstances of Eury.'s death are marked by brutality, revenge, and sophistic argumentation: cf. W. Allan, 'Euripides and the Sophists: Society and the Theatre of War', *ICS* 24-25 (1999-2000) 145-56. As Zuntz 38 observes, the play ends unexpectedly 'with the spectacle of disgusting cruelty. Like the ambiguous conclusion of a Platonic dialogue, it leaves the spectator with a disquieting question and thus stirs him to thinking.' It may be Alc. who exacts revenge, but the Chorus' complicity is unsettling. Only the Servant of Hyllus resists Alc.'s demands consistently (cf. 961-74n.).

C. Pelling (Intro. n. 120) 224 includes the *Hcld.* among the 'subversive' plays whose endings 'present ideals of domestic harmony or international peacefulness which clash against contemporary realities'. In other words, the play's idealization of Athens contrasts with (Athenian) acts of cruelty towards the innocent, defeated, or defenceless in the real theatre of war (cf. e.g. Thuc. 2.67.4, 3.25-36). Pelling's point is well made, yet in another respect it is not so much the clash as the likeness to contemporary reality which emerges most strongly from the play's finale. For the conduct of the Chorus recalls, in Fisher's words ((17-18n.) 427), 'the readiness even of well-meaning and principled powers to compromise in the face of the determination of one's allies and the calculation of political advantage'.

Tragedy reflects the dominant ideologies of its time, but it is not bound to endorse them. Even plays set in Attica may contain challenging or disquieting elements, and their 'Athenocentrism' and praise of Athens do not preclude critical reflection on contemporary events. Commenting on the resurgence of war at the end of Eur. *Suppl.*, Krummen (1993) 207 asks 'This admittedly encomiastic play of Athens, is it really not a tragic play?' So too with the *Hcld.*: Athens acts justly and gains a protector, but the triumph of revenge and self-interest over law makes for a more complex closure, and one that brings about a sudden 'redirection of our moral bearings' (Burian (1977) 20)

when the Hcld. are revealed as the ancestors of the Spartans. The kindness of Athens is contrasted with Alc.'s enforcement of a brutal and illegal revenge. Yet while the Athenians are assured of a heroic ally, the Chorus (like Alc.) are left at odds with the will of the city and the optimistic standards of the law.

All the extant plays of Eur. end with a choral coda (usually in anapaests). Barrett (on *Hipp.* 1462-6) has questioned their authenticity in general, but as Willink remarks (on *Or.* [1691-3]), 'there are no solid grounds for suspecting the non-recurrent tailpieces of *Hcld.*, *Hec.*, *Su.*, *El.*, *HF*. In contrast to the common supposition of a lacuna at the end of the play, very few scholars have doubted the authenticity of the choral anapaests, and I have tried to show that these lines are not only relevant to the dramatic context but also important for our interpretation of the Chorus. As D. Roberts observes ('Parting Words: Final Lines in Sophocles and Euripides', *CQ* 37 (1987) 51-64, 58 n. 28), the concluding lines of the *Hcld.* share certain features with other choral tail-pieces (the command and the reference to departure using στείχω), but this does not undermine their appropriateness here. For the departure motif as 'a prelude to new events that will follow', here the murder of Eury. by Hyllus' servants, see Dunn (1028-9n.) 18. As the servants and Eury. depart to the place of execution, the Chorus return to Marathon and Alc. reunites the children of Heracles in the temple of Zeus Agoraios.

Fragments

Four of the five alleged fragments of the *Hcld.* are quoted by Stobaeus (frr. 1, 2, 3, 5), two of these also by Orion (frr. 1, 5), who, however, does not name the play cited, while the remaining fragment is said to be a parody of a verse of Aristophanes (fr. 4). Stobaeus and Orion were anthologists, putting together collections of quotations from prose and poetry in the fifth century AD. Since these anthologies were themselves based on earlier collections of excerpts, the passages existed without their context and this could easily lead to corruption or false attribution. The anthologists provided writers, orators, and teachers with a handy collection of 'classic' passages, often of a moralizing character, with which they could adorn their own work or educate their pupils. That is, they were not primarily concerned with the accurate preservation of the text or its attribution (and so these details frequently fall out). Therefore, while they offer a valuable and independent alternative to the main manuscript tradition of the plays, anthology quotations must always be treated with caution and each one considered on its own merits.

1 [fr. 852 N]: Lines 1-2 only are quoted by Stobaeus (4.25.2) and attribued to *Hcld.* Orion (*flor. Eur.* 7) quotes the whole passage (without title), but since his text does not separate individual entries, it is quite possible that we have two fragments here, which were put together because of their common opening (ὅστις δέ) and similar sentiment (the importance of honouring one's parents). Wilamowitz (1882b) 345, however, not only took them to be a single fragment, but also understood them to be the conclusion of a missing speech (by Demophon) describing the sacrifice of Heracles' daughter. But as Méridier (Intro. n. 31) 190 points out, the emphasis on parents is not quite so apt, since the girl dies for her siblings, not for her parents (who are already dead). **1.2 both in life and in death:** καὶ ζῶν καὶ θανών occurs also at 320, in the speech of Iol. from which Stobaeus and Orion cite fr. 5, which also

speaks of parents (line 1 here). **1.3 †those who bore him†:** this is apt sense but unmetrical. Zuntz (1947) 47 n. 2 suggests that an anthologist may have introduced the mistake so as to make the citation match τοὺς τεκόντας (line 1). The original may have read τὸν φύσαντα (Meineke). The dual (τὼ φύσαντε Schneidewin) seems unlikely in a gnome. **1.4 in sacrifice to the gods:** the involvement of the wicked might prevent the ritual having its intended effect: cf. *Cho.* 291-6, Burkert (1985) 254-5. **1.5 putting ... to sea:** for the topos 'don't go to sea with the bad (or risk disaster)', cf. *Sept.* 602-4, Cropp on *El.* 1355.

2 [fr. 853 N]: Stobaeus (3.1.80) quotes these lines as coming from *Hcld.* They are evidently advice from an older person to a younger one (cf. τέκνον, line 1). Wilamowitz (1882b) 345-6 suggested Iolaus or Alcmene addressing Demophon in the lost scene, while Garzya (*Gnomon* 71 (1999) 289) thinks that they may have formed a short speech by Iolaus which has fallen out after 235, with the fragment's τρεῖς ... ἀρεταὶ preparing for Demophon's τρισσαί ... ὁδοί (236). But honouring parents and gods are such general gnomic utterances as to fit in almost anywhere in Greek poetry. **2.1 which:** for the article (τὰς) as relative, cf. Diggle 466 'The use of the article for the relative in Euripidean iambics is sufficiently rare to excite suspicion. Three instances are usually cited [*Andr.* 810, *El.* 279, *Bacch.* 712]. Only one of them appears invulnerable [*El.* 279].' The parallel between **the common laws of Greece** (2.3) and τοῖσιν Ἑλλήνων νόμοις (1010) is more striking, but hardly conclusive. So too with the **crown of fame** (2.4) and 534, 623-4.

3 [fr. 854 N]: Stobaeus (3.7.8) quotes these lines and attributes them to *Her.* Nauck, however, swayed by the reference to human sacrifice, changed *Her.* to *Hcld.* Wilamowitz (1882b) 344 placed them in a missing debate about the sacrifice of Heracles' daughter. Yet the contrasts between life and death, fame and pleasure, seem rather laboured, and if these lines were ever part of the *Her.* or *Hcld.*, they were probably due to actors' interpolation: cf. *Hel.* [298-302].

4 [fr. 851 N]: An ancient scholion to Ar. *Knights* 214 (produced at the Lenaea of 424) claims that this line parodies a verse of the *Hcld.* Comic parody of tragedy may operate by placing a verse unaltered in a ridiculous context or by adapting a verse slightly for comic effect. Since the word χορδεύειν ('to make sausages, make mince-meat') is unlikely to have appeared in tragedy, we are presumably dealing with the second kind of humour here, but nothing in the surviving text of the play seems a suitable target. Pearson (xxx, xxxvii) suggested that the original line may have occurred in the 'mutilated' Parodos. But while it is possible that the Chorus or the Herald used a phrase about 'mixing things up' at 110a-e, for example (76a seems less likely), this is hardly provable. The parodied line may have come from another part of the play (now lost), or, more likely, the scholiast was dealing with a corrupt text of the *Hcld.* Alternatively, as scholiasts often do, he may have misattributed the line himself or reproduced the false attribution from an earlier source.

5 [fr. 949 N]: Stobaeus (4.25.3) and Orion (*flor. Eur.* 9) quote this line after 297-8. However, Stobaeus (4.29.46) also cites 297-304 without this line, suggesting that it was easily removed from its context and thus an interpolation. As [299-301] make clear, ancient actors and producers were prone to expand gnomic statements and their sententious additions subsequently made their way into the anthologies. In any case, fragment 5 follows poorly

from 297-8: as Zuntz (1947) 47 points out, '"To honour one's parents" is a duty; it is in no way a γέρας ["gift"] to be put on an equal footing with the descent from a noble father.'

In conclusion, none of the alleged fragments seems likely to fit into the play as we have it in ms. L. Wilkins 194 remarks: 'I do not share Diggle's certainty that all the fragments are falsely attributed: one or two *could* belong to the lost lines at the end of the play; some may point to an alternative version of the play.' However, he does not specify which fragments he has in mind (wisely, for none is apt). It is also far from certain that any lines are missing from the end of the play (cf. 1052n.). Nevertheless, as Wilkins xxix-xxx himself points out (cf. Lesky (1977) 229-31, O'Connor-Visser (1987) 39-41), the fragments clearly do not support the theory of Kirchhoff and Wilamowitz that an entire 'sacrifice scene' has been deleted.